



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2003

No. 110

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Ben Haden, Changed Lives Ministries, Chattanooga, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Join me in prayer.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we come in simplicity and honesty. You are God; we are not. Thank You, Lord, for giving to these unique men and women the political gift to be elected and the opportunity to serve You, country, and their constituency. Bless us, Lord, on the inside and make Your will plain, that these Your leaders may lead and legislate to the honor of God and to the glory of this free country.

Bless us, Lord, in this war against terrorism with victory and balance. Humble us and teach us Your greatness, Your love, and Your forgiveness. And bless these our leaders with judgment, vision, and confidence in our future. I pray in the name of Jesus Christ, my personal Lord, my personal saviour, and my personal friend. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ETHERIDGE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING PASTOR BEN HADEN OF CHANGED LIVES MINISTRIES

(Mr. WAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome one of Chattanooga, Tennessee's finest citizens, Pastor Ben Haden, to the House of Representatives as our guest chaplain for today. It is very special to introduce Ben, because he is a humble man of God with a ministry that has touched thousands of lives.

Ben's first career was in the newspaper business; but in the middle of his life, Jesus Christ touched his heart and 4 decades of ministry began. He came to First Presbyterian Church of Chattanooga in 1967 and quickly gained a reputation for his passion, his heart, and his sermons. His popularity and ability to draw worshipers soon resulted in closed-circuit televisions being set up in the chapel and fellowship hall for overflow crowds.

Not long after coming to First Presbyterian, Ben launched his own radio ministry, "Changed Lives," on a radio station in Chattanooga. This ministry eventually grew to include a television program watched regularly by thousands, including the Reverend Billy Graham.

In March of 1999, Ben stepped down as senior pastor from the First Presbyterian Church to devote his full energies to his radio ministry "Changed Lives."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Father Coughlin for inviting Ben Haden to offer our invocation on this day that the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The Chair will entertain ten 1-minute speeches on each side.

### INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY MUST ACT NOW TO HELP THE PEOPLE OF BURMA

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, our State Department should urge, as all of us should, the U.N. Security Council to immediately address the ongoing conflict in Burma. Democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi remains disappeared, and the military junta will not disclose her whereabouts.

The so-called Burmese State Peace and Development Council, the SPDC, which is their name for the military junta, uses slave labor, child soldiers, and mass rape campaigns against the people, the exact opposite of bringing peace and development to Burma. Yet the SPDC is now lobbying surrounding governments to gain support for its rule.

The Prime Minister of Thailand has created a road map for peace in Burma, but the plan leaves the brutal dictatorship in power.

What will it take for the international community to act? How many political prisoners must be tortured and ethnic villagers brutally raped and then murdered? How long must somebody be held incommunicado before strong, decisive action against the SPDC is taken?

Mr. Speaker, the international community must act now to help the people of Burma.

### UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATE: STOP THE FEDS FROM PASSING THE BUCK FOR EDUCATION REFORM

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand that the Congress and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7333

the President stop passing the buck on education reform to our States and local communities.

Last week the House Committee on Rules held a hearing to consider the issue of unfunded mandates. As I have noted on several occasions on the House floor, the Bush administration's \$20 billion cut to the No Child Left Behind Act has created a massive unfunded Federal mandate. As the former superintendent of my State's public schools, I know firsthand that unfunded mandates will cause real pain at the local level.

I believe the Federal Government must live up to its obligation to fund education reform. It is simply wrong to pass a piece of legislation that says we are going to give you all that money to Leave No Child Left Behind and then leave the money behind, while still forcing schools to achieve new standards.

I have introduced legislation that requires full funding of the No Child Left Behind Act, and I urge my colleagues to join me in stopping the Federal practice of passing the buck to States and local communities.

#### HELP FROM UNEXPECTED PLACES

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the Bible asks the question, "From where does my help come from?" And sometimes help comes from unexpected places, like an anonymous civilian in Mosul who brought the sadistic sons of a dictator to justice yesterday; and like the words of a former President supporting the Bush administration's assertion that Saddam Hussein likely had weapons of mass destruction.

It was last night on CNN, former President Bill Clinton said, "When I left office, there was a substantial amount of biological and chemical material unaccounted for. That is, at the end of the first Gulf War we knew what he had. We knew what was destroyed in all the inspection processes. We bombed for 4 days in 1998, may have gotten it all, may have gotten half of it, may have gotten none of it, but we didn't know."

"So," President Clinton said, "I thought it was prudent for the President to go to the U.N."

And he went on to say, "If you don't cooperate, the penalty could be regime change, not just continued sanctions." So said former President Bill Clinton.

Thank you, President Clinton, for confirming what President Bush told America: Saddam Hussein had biological and chemical weapons and confronting him was prudent.

#### HADLEY? HARDLY!

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, Steven Hadley, the Deputy National Security Advisor, tried to take the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Advisor off the biggest hook in town by accepting the blame for the President falsely claiming in the State of the Union that Iraq was trying to go nuclear.

Hadley says he had "forgotten" the previous memos from Director Tenet discounting an Iraq-Niger uranium connection and neglected to remove this information from the speech.

So the American people are being asked to believe that the bogus major cause of war against Iraq eliminating a nuclear threat was advanced because a lower-level functionary simply overlooked a memo from a higher functionary, and that the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Advisor were all blissfully unaware of the fact that false nuclear claims they were circulating about Iraq were simply the result of a memo misfiled by a national security clerk named Hadley.

Hadley? Hardly. Hadley? Hardly. Hadley? Hardly.

#### LOSS OF A HERO

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas lost a hero last week. Tex Schramm, the former Dallas Cowboys president and general manager, died at the age of 83.

Mr. Schramm's passion focused on the Dallas Cowboys, but he was always looking out for the entire NFL. He had ideas ranging from using the phrase "America's team" to letting officials correct calls through instant replay.

In 1991 he became the first team executive elected to the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

His partnership with Coach Tom Landry produced 20 straight winning seasons, from 1966 to 1985, 18 playoff appearances, 13 division titles, five Super Bowl appearances, and two championships.

Tex Schramm was a significant force in the AFL-NFL merger in 1966; and he was the original chairman of the league's competition committee, a position he held from 1966 to 1988.

Instant replays and sideline radios in quarterback helmets were his ideas, but he also promoted the six-division, wild card playoff concept and will be forever remembered for introducing America to the Dallas Cowboys Cheerleaders.

To the man who left a hole in the Texas stadium roof so God could watch his team, Tex, I know you are watching too.

#### U.S. TRADE POLICIES ARE FAILING

Mr. DEFAZIO. Today Congress will vote on and approve so-called free

trade agreements with Singapore and Chile. We find our Nation sunk in the hole of a \$500 billion trade deficit, and Congress is going to get out the shovels and dig a little deeper.

Mr. Speaker, 251,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost so far this year, exported from the United States; 53,000 jobs in May alone. We have a record 136.1 trade deficit for the first 3 months on a track to \$550 billion trade deficit this year.

Our trade policies are failing our workers and our Nation and our future. And the response of this administration and this Congress is a collective yawn and a vote to continue down the same disastrous path. It is pathetic.

#### RECENT LEGISLATION CREATING LARGER GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that a lot of our recent legislation will create even larger government programs. We face large deficits; yet we continue to spend, and I am concerned.

Recently we had several amendments here on the House floor to reduce spending by 1 percent across the board, yet they failed. We have increased spending on education, agricultural subsidies, and AIDS in Africa, and a tax rebate for those who do not pay taxes. Now, honest men will call this income redistribution. We also have a new prescription drug benefit close at hand.

If we continue to add new government programs, we will create even a bigger and bigger government. Instead, we should try to solve our problems with conservative and free market principles, that is, bring choice, competition, and personal responsibility to our legislative initiatives.

□ 1015

#### AMERICAN NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it has been 803 days since President Bush and the Republican Party embarked on their economic plan for our country. During that time the national debt has increased by \$1,082,452,325,550. According to the website for the Bureau of Public Debt at the U.S. Department of Treasury, yesterday at 4:30 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, the Nation's outstanding debt was \$6,722,777,711,908. Furthermore, in fiscal year 2003, interest on our national debt, or the "debt tax," is \$277,768,492,816 through June 30, 2003.

#### IT IS TIME FOR ACTION ON MEDICARE REFORM

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 38th anniversary of Medicare.

Medicare has faithfully provided health care to nearly 40 million Americans. However, as Medicare nears its 40th year it is in a terrible crisis; a crisis of confidence, a crisis of finance, and a crisis of direction.

You see, Mr. Speaker, medical care is not the same today that it was 38 years ago. That is why I supported H.R. 1, legislation that will finally grant America's seniors the health care choice and prescription drug benefits that they have waited almost 4 decades to enjoy. It is time for action. I urge my colleagues to join with me in protecting, preserving, and enhancing Medicare.

#### HONORING DR. MICHAEL DEBAKEY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Michael DeBakey is a friend of mine, a friend of the community. The renowned House surgeon is a cherished member of the Houston community, the State of Texas and this Nation. That is why I was so proud as a Texan to be able to carry legislation that would name the Houston Veterans Hospital in my Congressional district after this great American. In so doing, I sought the support of all of the members of the Texas delegation and carried the legislation in both the 107th and 108th Congress.

Lo and behold, everyone signed to be a co-sponsor except the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY. Although we asked on several occasions, his sponsorship did not occur. But yet I pursued because I believe that the honor was owed to Dr. DeBakey. I would think that Texans would be able to work together. But in the dark of night, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), I understand, a colleague, offered a late night amendment in the VA-HUD bill without contacting our office, without talking to my constituents, without working in a collaborative effort.

I did not know to what level we would get in breaking collegiality in this body, but I believe it has gone to its lowest level. I pay tribute to Dr. DeBakey. I will continue to work to make sure this legislation is passed and signed, but I will not stand and have my constituents or the 18th Congressional District so disrespected by colleagues in this body. It is a shame and a disgrace to the way we have worked together on behalf of Texas.

To Dr. DeBakey, I salute you. We will get this legislation passed and it will be passed with the love, admiration and respect of the people of the 18th Congressional District, not with underhanded tactics to undermine indi-

viduals who are working on behalf of their constituents.

#### INDIA INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend India on its annual celebration of Independence Day on August 15, 1947. Happy 56th birthday, Republic of India, the world's largest democracy and friend of America, the world's oldest democracy.

On that day, India became a free nation modeling its constitution after our own. For nearly 56 years the people of India have faithfully adhered to democratic principles. During the Cold War we were not allied as closely as we should have been. However, times have changed now. India's economy is rapidly reforming and historic joint military exercises are taking place between our two great nations.

According to Ambassador Lalit Mansingh, trade between India and America soared 20 percent last year. Also, importantly, the Indian American community should be recognized for their leadership, entrepreneurship, family values and faith. Many Indian Americans left their homelands, immediately assimilated and have achieved great success in America. As cochair of the India Caucus I am so proud of this dynamic community in South Carolina and nationwide.

It is my sincerest hope that this new friendship between the United States and India blossoms into a solid, serious relationship between mutual allies.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

#### PATRIOT ACT ABUSES

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, when the PATRIOT Act was enacted in the aftermath of September 11, civil rights advocates expressed great concern about the potential for abuse of the law by law enforcement officials. Unfortunately, many of their concerns were warranted.

The Inspector General recently delivered findings of a new government investigation to Congress. In it he states that his office acted on 34 credible PATRIOT Act violations in the first half of 2003 alone and that he received over 270 allegations of abuse.

The complaints are diverse. They range from an officer holding a loaded gun to the head of a detainee, to a prison guard ordering a Muslim inmate to remove his shirt so that the guards could use it to shine his shoes. These incidents are intolerable and they demand further review, and I commend the Inspector General for bringing them to our attention.

The PATRIOT Act was intended to enhance our homeland security, not to create an atmosphere of bigotry and abuse towards our immigrant communities.

While the safety of our citizens is paramount, we must take caution to find a balance that preserves our civil liberties on which our great Nation was founded.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR ARMISTICE

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the upcoming 50th anniversary of the Korean War Armistice and to honor all of the brave veterans who served in this conflict. On July 27, 1953, the Korean War Armistice Agreement took effect ending a 3-year war that was a crucial step in stopping the spread of communism and Soviet influence. U.S. troops, along with their allies, turned back North Korea's aggression and protected South Korea from falling into communist rule.

Today South Korea stands as a beacon, an economically prosperous republic, and a part of the world where stable democracies are not usually the norm.

We all know by reading the headlines that things are not so good just across the 38th Parallel.

Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the 50th anniversary of the end of the Korean War. It is important that we be eternally grateful to the men and women who took part in this campaign, for without their sacrifices the fall of the Soviet Union may never have been possible.

#### WHEN DO WE GET THE INVESTIGATION

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the White House is beginning to sound more and more like Animal House, in that you have a bunch of adolescents over there and they keep running forward saying, I did it, I did it.

First it was Mr. Tenet and now we have Mr. Hadley. When are we going to get the truth? When are we going to have an investigation, not in secret, done by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, but out in the open. They did it in the British Parliament. They were not afraid of democracy there. But here we have to have everything secret. We need an investigation about who did it.

Where was Condoleezza Rice? This guy Hadley worked for her. Does she make the decisions or does he? I have not heard her stand up and say, well, if I had only put my hand up and said no, it would not have happened.

But what is even more devious about this is if you complain they attack. A Senator, a member of the other body, was attacked because he pointed out that somebody in the White House had the nerve, the nerve to uncover a CIA operative. That is a Federal crime.

Now, if we do not have an investigation and find out who it is in the White House that thinks they can just get on the horn and talk to a newspaper reporter and say, hey, did you know so and so was working for the CIA? That person should be fired immediately and probably charged. But we know they were sent out there to do it by the folks upstairs.

When we will have another, oh, gee, I did not know, I should not have done it?

When do we get the investigation, Mr. Speaker?

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state the inquiry.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is as to when the privileged resolution of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means, will be brought up before the House.

The SPEAKER. It is in order sometime today at the discretion of the Chair.

Ms. PELOSI. Would that be very late at night or would it be during the day when people would have a chance to hear the debate?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentlewoman that he will take that under consideration. It is the intent of the Chair to have it during regular business hours today.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, my concern springs from the fact that we have a long legislative day today.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—MANNER OF CONDUCTING MARKUP OF LEGISLATION IN COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a resolution (H. Res. 330) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas during a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means on July 18, 2003, for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1776, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

Whereas during the reading of that amendment the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee directed majority staff of the committee to ask the United States Capitol Police to remove minority-party members of the committee from a room of the committee during the meeting, causing the United States Capitol Police thereupon to confront the minority-party members of the committee;

Whereas pending a unanimous-consent request to dispense with the reading of that amendment the chairman deliberately and improperly refused to recognize a legitimate and timely objection by a member of the committee;

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the manner in which Representative Thomas summoned the United States Capitol Police to evict minority party members of the Committee on Ways and Means from the committee library, as well as the manner in which he conducted the markup of legislation in the Committee on Ways and Means on July 18, 2003, and finds that the bill considered at that markup was not validly ordered reported to the House, and calls for the police report to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. DELAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELAY moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 193, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Capito	Garrett (NJ)
Akin	Carter	Gerlach
Bachus	Castle	Gibbons
Baker	Chabot	Gilchrest
Ballenger	Chocola	Gillmor
Barrett (SC)	Coble	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Collins	Goode
Barton (TX)	Cox	Goodlatte
Bass	Crane	Goss
Beauprez	Crenshaw	Granger
Bereuter	Cubin	Graves
Biggert	Culberson	Green (WI)
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Tom	Gutknecht
Blackburn	Deal (GA)	Harris
Blunt	DeLay	Hart
Boehlert	DeMint	Hastert
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes
Bonner	Doolittle	Hayworth
Bono	Dreier	Hefley
Boozman	Duncan	Hensarling
Bradley (NH)	Dunn	Herger
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hobson
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Hoekstra
Brown-Waite,	English	Hostettler
Ginny	Everett	Houghton
Burgess	Feeney	Hulshof
Burns	Flake	Hunter
Burr	Fletcher	Hyde
Burton (IN)	Foley	Isakson
Buyer	Forbes	Issa
Calvert	Fossella	Istook
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Janklow
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Cantor	Gallegly	Johnson (CT)

Johnson (IL)	Northup	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Norwood	Shadegg
Jones (NC)	Nunes	Shaw
Keller	Nussle	Shays
Kelly	Osborne	Shimkus
Kennedy (MN)	Ose	Shuster
King (IA)	Otter	Simmons
King (NY)	Oxley	Simpson
Kingston	Paul	Smith (MI)
Kirk	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Kline	Pence	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Kolbe	Petri	Sullivan
LaHood	Pickering	Sweeney
Latham	Pitts	Tancredo
LaTourette	Platts	Tauzin
Leach	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Terry
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Thomas
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Putnam	Tiahrt
Lucas (OK)	Quinn	Tiberi
Manzullo	Radanovich	Toomey
McCotter	Ramstad	Turner (OH)
McCrery	Regula	Upton
McHugh	Rehberg	Vitter
McInnis	Renzi	Walden (OR)
McKeon	Reynolds	Walsh
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Wamp
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Weller
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Murphy	Royce	Wicker
Musgrave	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (NM)
Myrick	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Nethercutt	Saxton	Wolf
Neugebauer	Schrock	Young (FL)
Ney	Sensenbrenner	

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Green (TX)	Meek (FL)
Ackerman	Grijalva	Meeks (NY)
Alexander	Gutierrez	Menendez
Allen	Hall	Michaud
Andrews	Harman	Millender-
Baca	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Baird	Hill	Miller (NC)
Baldwin	Hinchey	Miller, George
Ballance	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Becerra	Hoeffel	Moran (VA)
Bell	Holden	Murtha
Berman	Holt	Nadler
Berry	Honda	Napolitano
Bishop (NY)	Hooley (OR)	Neal (MA)
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Neerstar
Boswell	Inslee	Obey
Boyd	Israel	Olver
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Pascarell
Capps	John	Pastor
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Pelosi
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Carson (OK)	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Case	Kildee	Rahall
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Cooper	Kind	Reyes
Costello	Klecicka	Rodriguez
Cramer	Kucinich	Ross
Crowley	Lampson	Rothman
Cummings	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Davis (AL)	Lantos	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (FL)	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Lee	Sabo
DeFazio	Levin	Sanchez, Linda
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	T.
Delahunt	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lofgren	Sanders
Deutscher	Lowe	Sandlin
Dicks	Lucas (KY)	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lynch	Schiff
Doggett	Majette	Scott (GA)
Dooley (CA)	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Markey	Serrano
Edwards	Marshall	Sherman
Emanuel	Matheson	Skelton
Engel	Matsui	Slaughter
Eshoo	McCarthy (MO)	Smith (WA)
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Evans	McCollum	Solis
Farr	McDermott	Spratt
Filner	McGovern	Stark
Frost	McIntyre	Stenholm
Gonzalez	McNulty	Strickland
Gordon	Meehan	Stupak

Tanner	Udall (CO)	Waxman
Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Weiner
Taylor (MS)	Van Hollen	Wexler
Thompson (CA)	Velazquez	Woolsey
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wu
Tierney	Waters	Wynn
Towns	Watson	
Turner (TX)	Watt	

## NOT VOTING—19

Berkley	Davis, Jo Ann	Moore
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Owens
Boucher	Ferguson	Sherwood
Clay	Ford	Souder
Cole	Frank (MA)	Young (AK)
Conyers	Gephardt	
Davis (TN)	Jefferson	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1050

Mr. BILIRAKIS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 410, had I been present, I would have voted "nay".

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 326 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2799.

□ 1052

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2799) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Tuesday, July 22, 2003, the bill had been read through page 103, line 26, and pending was the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each have 1 minute remaining in the debate on the amendment. The gentleman from Arizona has the right to close.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished and vibrant leader of the minority.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Levin amendment and commend the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership in bringing this important amendment to the floor and his important work on behalf of America's working families.

As House Democratic leader, I proudly assert the Democratic Party's commitment to trade and what it does for our economy. That commitment to trade was exemplified in President Kennedy's 1962 State of the Union Address, which I point to with great pride. At that time President Kennedy said: "For together we face a common challenge: to enlarge the prosperity of free men everywhere, to build in partnership a new trading community in which all free nations may gain from the productive energy of free competitive effort."

That was his challenge and it was followed up by the Kennedy Round, the most ambitious round of trade negotiations under the aegis of GATT until that time. The Kennedy Round lasted from 1963 to 1967. Its goal was to lift up developing countries of the world, open our markets to their products to help them develop and create markets for U.S. products abroad. The gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. LEVIN) amendment is in keeping with that proud tradition. I thank the gentleman.

Last night the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished representative of the majority party on this debate and chairman of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Subcommittee said "I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for the crafting of this particular amendment. With it I think he has shown a great deal of legislative brilliance and some policy ingenuity as well." Then the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) went on to oppose the amendment by saying "But I have to say the net result is quite mischievous."

I beg to differ, and I leave it up to my colleagues and am asking them to support the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. LEVIN) amendment. Is it mischievous to ask the Trade Representative in negotiating for a Free Trade Area of the Americas with the Central America Freed Trade Amendment to protect against piracy of copyright? Is it mischievous to say that we should not support a treaty that does not open markets for United States agricultural products, high technology, and other manufactured exports that provide greater rights? Is it mischievous to tell him not to support a trade agreement that provides greater rights for foreign investors than Americans in the United States? And is it mischievous to ask that Trade Representative not to acquire adoption and enforcement of the basic prohibitions on exploitative child labor, forced labor, and discrimination and to guarantee the right to associate and bargain collectively?

A vote for the Levin amendment is a vote for America's workers who see our manufacturing and technological base

fading away. American workers are the most productive workers in the world. Let us let them compete. The gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. LEVIN) amendment does just that. I urge my colleagues to support the Levin amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to set the order of how we are doing this, last night we had the debate for the most part on the substance of this, and so at the conclusion of my remarks I will make a point of order that I reserved last night that this amendment is not in order.

□ 1100

I did say, indeed, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Michigan was ingenious in the device of this amendment. He was very clever.

It does not mean I think it is right in policy. Indeed, I think it is very wrong policy, because what it does is say that no funds shall be expended by the U.S. Trade Representative unless the negotiations do exactly the following things. In other words, the USTR is in a straitjacket from the very beginning of negotiations.

The very essence of a negotiation on trade agreement is we give something here, the other side gives something there. But to demand they have exact parity from the very beginning absolutely destroys the essence of a negotiation. That is the substance of what we are talking about here.

It would be very bad policy. It would essentially mean that we could not have a Central American Free Trade Agreement or a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas. We would essentially be saying to the Ecuadorans and the Salvadorans and the Costa Ricans that we will never allow them to trade with us, that we do not care that they are in poverty, we do not want to give them the opportunity to trade with the United States, to have access to our markets. It would be bad policy.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that I reserved last evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the substance of the remarks that I just made go right to the point of order.

I do make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law the amendment imposes additional duties."

As I will explain in my appeal, this clearly imposes additional duties, and I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Do other Members wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I spoke last night, and I will be very, very

brief. I disagree with the gentleman's analysis of what is appropriate here under the rules.

I also want to mention, last night when we discussed the provision that says there shall be no funds made available for negotiating a CAFTA or an FTAA that does not require adoption and enforcement of the basic prohibitions on exploitive child labor, forced labor and discrimination and guarantee of the right to associate and bargain collectively, that the important matter was a job, and not what was in that job, what payment there was for the job or under what conditions the job was carried on.

I think that is terribly wrong. If people are going to have a chance to climb up the ladder, they have to have a chance to be able to associate and to bargain collectively. We should not base a trade agreement on the suppression of the workers of Central America or of any other place in the Americas.

So, I urge that the Chair rule this in order, and we are now prepared to hear the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, I would just like to respond to what the gentleman from Michigan said.

The Levin amendment would forbid expenditure of funds that would be used to negotiate free trade agreements that do not contain certain listed provisions. The listed provisions impose duties that are not now required by law and they make the appropriations contingent upon the performance of the new duty and on successful trade negotiations with other countries.

For example, in the area of labor law, the Levin amendment seeks provisions in a trade agreement that would mandate, mandate, adoption in domestic law and enforcement of the basic recognized rights of workers. This sharply contrasts with the Trade Act, which only goes so far as to seek to promote respect for workers' rights, to promote universal ratification and full compliance with the ILO Convention 182.

The differences between the approach of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the current law are manifold. The Trade Act does not call for adoption and enforcement of the labor rights listed in the Jordan Free Trade Agreement. Indeed, the Trade Act seems to uphold the right of other countries to establish domestic labor standards.

Similarly, in investment, Mr. Chairman, the Levin amendment seeks provisions in a trade agreement that would ensure the free trade agreement does not provide for an investor's greater rights than Americans. This also contrasts sharply with the Trade Act, which carefully states that foreign investors are not to be afforded greater substantive rights. The Levin amendment would deny foreign investors greater procedural rights as well as substantive rights, and certainly this would be a duty not present in the U.S. law.

So for that reason, and for others that I could go on, I would urge the Chair to make a ruling that this amendment is not in order.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond very briefly. In those respects, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is very wrong. This does not change existing law. Our USTR representative is not prohibited by the present Trade Promotion Act, is not prohibited from carrying out the provisions that are spelled out here that there shall be no greater rights for foreign investors than Americans in the U.S. There is nothing in TPA that prohibits his doing just that; and there is nothing in the present TPA, which I opposed, but there is nothing, and we had an alternative, that prohibits the USTR from requiring adoption and enforcement of the basic prohibitions on exploitative child labor, forced labor and discrimination, and the guarantee of the right to associate and bargain collectively.

We are saying in this amendment that that is exactly what the USTR should be doing, and I ask the Chair to rule in our favor.

The CHAIRMAN. Do other Members wish to be heard?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is not in order under clause 2 of rule XXI. The amendment would limit funds for negotiating two specific specified trade agreements that fail to achieve specified goals. However, the amendment does not define those goals nor tie them to provisions in existing laws.

Therefore, the amendment imposes new duties on the Trade Representative to determine whether the proposed agreements protect against piracy of copyrights, open markets for United States agriculture products, et cetera, before applying the limitation. As such, the amendment imposes new duties not required by existing law in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this 15-minute vote on the appeal of the decision of the Chair may be followed by 5-minute votes on the four amendments debated last night on which requests for recorded votes were postponed.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 198, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

#### AYES—231

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Ose
Akin	Gillmor	Otter
Bachus	Gingrey	Oxley
Baker	Goode	Paul
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Goss	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Graves	Petri
Bass	Green (WI)	Pickering
Beauprez	Greenwood	Pitts
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Platts
Biggart	Hall	Pombo
Bilirakis	Harris	Porter
Blackburn	Hart	Portman
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Boehlert	Hayes	Putnam
Boehner	Hayworth	Quinn
Bonilla	Hefley	Radanovich
Bonner	Hensarling	Ramstad
Bono	Herger	Regula
Boozman	Hobson	Rehberg
Boyd	Hoekstra	Renzi
Bradley (NH)	Hostettler	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Houghton	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Isakson	Ros-Lehtinen
Burns	Issa	Royce
Burr	Istook	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Janklow	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Jenkins	Saxton
Calvert	John	Schrock
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Johnson (IL)	Sessions
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Capito	Jones (NC)	Shaw
Carter	Keller	Shays
Castle	Kelly	Sherwood
Chabot	Kennedy (MN)	Shimkus
Chocola	King (IA)	Shuster
Coble	King (NY)	Simmons
Cole	Kingston	Simpson
Collins	Kirk	Smith (MI)
Cox	Kline	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Souder
Cubin	LaHood	Stearns
Culberson	Latham	Stenholm
Cunningham	LaTourette	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Leach	Sweeney
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Tancred
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
DeLay	Linder	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	LoBiondo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Thornberry
Dooley (CA)	McCotter	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McCrery	Tiberi
Dreier	McHugh	Toomey
Duncan	McInnis	Turner (OH)
Dunn	McKeon	Upton
Ehlers	Mica	Vitter
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
English	Miller (MI)	Walsh
Everett	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Feeney	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Murphy	Weldon (PA)
Fletcher	Musgrave	Weller
Foley	Myrick	Whitfield
Forbes	Nethercutt	Wicker
Fossella	Neugebauer	Wilson (NM)
Franks (AZ)	Ney	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Wolf
Gallely	Norwood	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes	Young (FL)
Gerlach	Nussle	
Gibbons	Osborne	

#### NOES—198

Abercrombie	Boswell	Costello
Ackerman	Boucher	Cramer
Alexander	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Allen	Brown (OH)	Cummings
Andrews	Brown, Corrine	Davis (AL)
Baca	Capps	Davis (CA)
Baird	Capuano	Davis (FL)
Baldwin	Cardin	Davis (IL)
Ballance	Cardoza	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Bell	Carson (OK)	DeGette
Berman	Case	Delahunt
Berry	Clay	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Deutsch
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Dicks
Blumenauer	Cooper	Dingell

Doggett	Levin	Reyes
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Edwards	Lipinski	Ross
Emanuel	Lofgren	Rothman
Engel	Lowe	Roybal-Allard
Eshoo	Lucas (KY)	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	Lynch	Rush
Evans	Majette	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Maloney	Sabo
Fattah	Markey	Sanchez, Linda
Filner	Marshall	T.
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
Frost	Matsui	Sanders
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Green (TX)	McCollum	Schiff
Grijalva	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Gutierrez	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Harman	McIntyre	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Sherman
Hill	Meehan	Skelton
Hinchey	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Hoefel	Menendez	Snyder
Holden	Michaud	Solis
Holt	Millender-	Spratt
Honda	McDonald	Stark
Hooley (OR)	Miller (NC)	Strickland
Hoyer	Miller, George	Stupak
Insole	Mollohan	Tanner
Israel	Moore	Tauscher
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Thompson (CA)
(TX)	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Jefferson	Napolitano	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Towns
Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Turner (TX)
Kanjorski	Obey	Udall (CO)
Kaptur	Oliver	Udall (NM)
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Kildee	Owens	Velazquez
Kilpatrick	Pallone	Visclosky
Kind	Pascrell	Waters
Klecza	Pastor	Watson
Kucinich	Payne	Watt
Lampson	Pelosi	Waxman
Langevin	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Lantos	Pomeroy	Wexler
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Larson (CT)	Rahall	Wu
Lee	Rangel	Wynn

## NOT VOTING—5

Berkley	Ferguson	Gephardt
Bishop (UT)	Ford	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1127

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2799) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1582

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1582.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2738, UNITED STATES-CHILE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, AND H.R. 2739, UNITED STATES-SINGAPORE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 329

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2738) to implement the United States-Chile Free Trade Agreement. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The bill shall be debatable for two hours, with one hour and forty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Pursuant to section 151(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2739) to implement the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The bill shall be debatable for two hours, with one hour and forty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Pursuant to section 151(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion.

SEC. 3. During consideration of H.R. 2738 or H.R. 2739 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very able colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this moment, we begin debate on the first two measures that will propel our Nation's economy into the 21st century

and secure America's economic future. The free trade agreements with Chile and Singapore that we will be debating today are important in and of themselves. But more important, they are the first steps in completing a global economic and trade agenda that seeks to grow our economy by opening up markets overseas and establishing the United States as the leader in the international trade arena.

□ 1130

When Trade Promotion Authority lapsed back in 1994, the executive branch's ability to negotiate meaningful trade agreements was severely impaired. Our efforts to position the United States as the global leader in international trade were stalled. As recently as last year, there were nearly 150 regional free trade and customs agreements put into place worldwide and the United States, the greatest economic power on the face of the Earth, was party to only three of those agreements.

Mr. Speaker, we were losing market share, we were losing tariff battles, and most important, we were losing opportunities for U.S. workers and U.S. producers, opportunity to grow our economy, opportunity to increase the incomes of millions of American families and the opportunity to lead once again in the global marketplace. All of this was being lost as we went through that nearly decade long period, Mr. Speaker, when we did not have that authority in place for the executive branch.

So it was to my great satisfaction last year that we were able to enact into law a renewal of that Trade Promotion Authority. I am also pleased that the Bush administration has responded to Congressional reauthorization of the Trade Promotion Authority with great enthusiasm.

Our terrific Ambassador, U.S. Trade Representative Bob Zoellick, in particular, has been the driving force behind an ambitious and far-reaching trade agenda that will open up markets and raise standards of living both here and abroad, throughout the world. It is very clear that trade is a win-win. We will see benefits on both sides.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the free trade agreements that we consider here today are of great importance. But I am gratified to see that many more trade agreements are on the horizon. Once we get beyond the Singapore and Chile agreements we will have a wide range of other great opportunities for U.S. workers and U.S. producers. We will soon see those benefits come to us and we will see the multilateral agreements as we proceed with Central America, South America, Africa, the Middle East and Australia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that many in this body are opposed to some or possibly all of the free trade agreements that I have just mentioned. And I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that Congressional renewal of Trade Promotion Authority last year was very contentious

and as we all know passed by the narrowest of margins on three occasions. But I sincerely hope that today we will demonstrate our bipartisan commitment to improving the economic standing of all American workers and families by strongly supporting the two implementing measures before us.

In fact, we have just a few minutes ago had the minority leader stand in the well and talk about that commitment that the minority party has to the trade agenda, and so there will be a wonderful opportunity here to demonstrate that. The agreement, Mr. Speaker, with Singapore and Chile are perfect examples of what the benefits of free trades can and will deliver to the American people.

Now, we all recognize that Singapore has been a critical ally in Southeast Asia in the war against terrorism. It has been more welcoming to our efforts to clamp down on regional instability and global terrorism than perhaps any other Southeast Asia nation. Singapore is also an extremely important economic ally of the United States. For example, Mr. Speaker, Singapore was the 12th largest trading partner with the United States last year in terms of total trade. Now, that is not bad for a country that has a population that is about the size of a county that I represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Singapore agreement lowers barriers to trade in high technology products and services and establishes unprecedented intellectual properties protections. Intellectual properties protections are of paramount importance and very much need to be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement pays particular attention to protecting copyrights, patents and trademarks for emerging technologies and digital products, sectors where American innovation has been, continues to be, and I believe will in the future be the global leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that by lowering and eliminating tariffs that Singapore places on American exports that we will increase job opportunities right here at home. Let me underscore that again.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is so much talk about the union influence and the union opposition about what it is we are trying to do here, but Mr. Speaker, it stands to reason that if you are opening up new markets in other parts of the world, as will be the case in Singapore and so many of these service oriented areas, telecommunications for example, there will be more union jobs created right here in the United States as these markets open.

Mr. Speaker, like the Singapore agreement, the Free Trade Agreement with Chile will increase trading opportunities abroad. Under the agreement negotiated by Ambassador Zoellick, Chile will immediately remove its 6 percent tariff that exists on more than 85 percent of American exports.

I have to scratch my head once again, Mr. Speaker, and wonder why it

is again that anyone would believe that this agreement would not create an opportunity for U.S. workers, union, non-union members, workers all the way across the board if they are going to immediately reduce their 6 percent tariff that exists on 85 percent of the products that come from U.S. workers into Chile's market.

Mr. Speaker, the remaining tariffs will phase out over the next 12 years. Conversely, most of Chile's exports to the United States are already duty free. So the fact is the world has access to the U.S. consumer markets. Chile can already get their products here. Doing anything other than supporting this measure will not help U.S. workers. The only benefit to U.S. workers will come from our breaking down those barriers that exist there. Recognizing Chile's relatively small trading relationship with the United States, some might question the need for a Free Trade Agreement at this time. In other words, people will say, why bother?

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well worth the bother. In 1997, California exported about \$490 million worth of goods to Chile. By 2001, the number had decreased by \$140 million largely due to Chile's implementation of trade agreements with Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Canada, getting into the MERCOSUR and other trading blocs. So the fact that other nations are embarking on these agreements, breaking down tariff barriers have unfortunately diminished the flow of U.S. goods into Chile. So it stands to reason now that we need to do everything we can to make sure we are part of that tariff tax reduction effort because a tariff is a tax, and we know that by cutting it we will be able to improve the opportunities for that flow of goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, as we work to get our economy back on track and we all, Democrats and Republicans alike, are committed to enhancing our economy, to improving the plight of workers in this country and creating more and more opportunities, as we work to do that, clearly establishing trade rules within the Americas and the Doha negotiations, it is important that the United States of America be the leader and not the follower. Strong votes, strong bipartisan votes in favor of the Chile and Singapore agreements will mark the first steps in ensuring that the United States reaps the benefit of free trade.

It is time for the United States to unleash our enterprising spirit and allow American entrepreneurs access to some of the fastest growing markets in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong bipartisan support for this rule and the underlying measures in order to demonstrate the commitment of this body to long-term, bold and dynamic economic growth, the development of strong economies, good governments and the rule of law abroad, which will only help in dealing with the many challenges

that we face for peace and stability throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, of course, let me thank my very good friend, the distinguished and able chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding me time.

As the chairman well knows, he and I both share a passion for the types of issues which will be debated today, and while we do not always end up at the same place at the end of the day, I deeply appreciate his commitment to these issues.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has already pointed out, this rule would allow for consideration of both the U.S.-Chile and U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreements. What the chairman did not point out, however, was that this rule in a very real sense is unnecessary. The Trade Promotion Authority bill, or Fast Track, that was passed last year by Congress very strictly limits the way trade bills can come to the House floor. By law the agreements cannot be amended. They must be debated and moved expeditiously and in numerous other ways restrict the normal rights that Members of this Chamber are normally able to exercise.

Despite the restrictions imposed by Fast Track, the majority has decided to impose even more restrictive debate on these important bills today. In fact, few previous trade agreements have been given as little time to be debated as the House will have for these two measures today.

Let me repeat for the House what I said to the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) last night. We should not be setting a precedent for future trade deals by limiting debate to a couple of hours. In the future there will be other trade agreements that will come to this floor with more acrimony than today's do. These should, indeed must be considered for more than a cursory amount of time.

□ 1145

While I do not oppose today's rule, I will in the future if the majority again attempts to limit debate, more so than that which is required by law.

Substantively, as a member of the Congressional Oversight Group on Trade, I want to commend Trade Representative Robert Zoellick and his staff for the yeoman's work they have put forward over the past 2-plus years putting these agreements together. I have an acute appreciation for the very delicate negotiations that are needed to achieve the success that has brought us to this point. So, again, I congratulate Ambassador Zoellick and his staff.

Let me also say that as we move forward with our new Congressional Oversight Group on Trade, I would like Ambassador Zoellick to continue to keep

the Members engaged and involved in the process as much as possible.

Specifically, it would be helpful if the ambassador and his staff would provide to the oversight group negotiating text several weeks before they are brought to the House of Representatives for tabling. Any less does not provide Members of Congress and our staff the appropriate amount of time to thoroughly review the agreements and offer our substantive insight.

Additionally, when members of the Congressional Oversight Group on Trade do offer constructive proposals, if the Trade Representative ultimately rebuffs those suggestions, it would be helpful to know for what reasons congressional insight was rejected; and I might add, counter to that I raised with Ambassador Zoellick, the fact that in Singapore and in the trade agreement that there was a defense component; and I think the government of Singapore is to be complimented by all of us for the extraordinary undertakings that they put forward on behalf of our United States military who make a substantial number of ports of call in Singapore. So I saw and pointed out to the ambassador the defense component; and I might add, I think that it was taken to heart by the ambassador and his staff in their negotiations.

Finally, text of proposed trade agreements must be made public as soon as the notice of intent to sign is made, if not sooner. Failing that, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the American people to have meaningful input.

Again, though, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be nitpicky. These agreements were reached in an admirable fashion by the Trade Representative and those working with him; and I salute him for that, as well as his interlocutors, in what were 2 years of difficult and dynamic negotiations that will affect globally the trade and will affect the United States in substantial ways.

I look forward to the spirited debate which I am certain will follow.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply thank my colleague for his very thoughtful statement and his willingness to be supportive of this effort here. This sort of buttresses a couple of arguments I was making earlier on this union issue, and I say it specifically with the gentleman in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, because I know this is an issue that was of concern to the Chair.

One of the arguments that has been made has to do with the issue of exporting automobiles, automobiles manufactured right here in the United States of America. Under this agreement with Chile, we actually see Chile agree to an elimination of the luxury auto tax; and by eliminating that tax under this agreement in Chile, it will enhance the chance for us to see the exportation of more U.S.-manufactured

automobiles into Chile's market which admittedly is a small one but is growing.

Also, there are agreements to reduce foreign duties for trucks, computers, electrical equipment, paper and construction equipment as well; and so I think that this clearly is again a great opportunity for U.S. workers.

There have been several great champions of trade on our side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle. One of them is the great chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and the House, my very good friend from Atlanta, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 329, a rule that will enable the House to consider two historic free trade agreements. I urge all of my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this rule.

Approval of this rule will allow the House to proceed to consider H.R. 2738, a U.S. free trade agreement with Chile; and H.R. 2739, a U.S. free trade agreement with Singapore.

I consider it an honor to have worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the Committee on Rules chairman, and our House leadership in generating the needed support for these important trade agreements; and I am pleased that they are being considered on the House floor today.

One of the main reasons that the United States of America is a shining beacon on the hill for so many others is our open markets. These open markets help bring wider choices and lower prices for businesses and consumers at home and help to promote better relationships for the U.S. abroad. Trade also helps to build strong economies and assists in fighting poverty and hunger all around the world.

As we continue in the fight against global terrorism, trade can and should be used as a tool to help spread democracy, American values, and stability.

As Governor Ronald Reagan recognized in a 1974 speech: "Constructive trade, the two-way exchange of goods and services, is the most efficient and logical way for each nation and each area of the world to build a stable prosperity, a prosperity based not on aid, but on mutually beneficial economic contacts." I believe that free trade is beneficial to both the United States and our trading partners and is a principal component of proliferating the principles of freedom and democracy worldwide.

Trade is also particularly good for America's small businesses. Small business is the backbone of our Nation's economy, creating three out of every four new jobs and generating roughly half of the U.S. private gross domestic product; 97 percent of America's exporters are small businesses. To

stay at the forefront of innovation, U.S. small businesses need access to foreign markets.

The U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement will not only bring new market access for U.S. consumers and industrial products, but also new opportunities for our farmers and ranchers. More than 85 percent of trade in the areas of agriculture, construction, automobiles, technology, medical equipment, and paper products will be tariff-free immediately, with most of the remaining tariffs being phased out over 4 years.

Georgia, the State that I am proud to represent, has benefited significantly from trade with Chile. In fact, in 2001, Georgia had the 15th most exports to Chile in the entire United States. These exports have and will continue to provide high-paying jobs to the citizens of Georgia.

The U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement, America's first trade agreement in Asia, is critical because it will give U.S. professionals new access into the fields of financial services, telecommunications, advertising and engineering, to name just a few. We must act now and approve these free trade agreements to give U.S. exporters the chance to compete on a level playing field with foreign exporters.

I believe that America must continue to strive toward expanded free trade and not retreat into the mistaken protectionism of the past. We must work to open markets, eliminate tariffs and barriers, and ensure that our Nation remains at the forefront of global economic success. The freedom to trade is a basic human liberty, and its exercise across political borders unites people in peaceful cooperation and mutual prosperity.

In his last speech as the last British Governor of Hong Kong, Chris Patten spoke about trade; and he said this: If a planetary spaceship had come to the planet Earth in the 16th century from the muddy flats of teepee-strewn North America to the typhoid-driven Longmen, to the warring planes in Paris and landed in the Ming dynasty, they would have concluded in a millisecond that China would rule the world for centuries. She had recently discovered gun powder, the printing press. She had a moderate sea and a growing and rich culture, and then she built a wall around herself and history told a different tale.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule. We need to proceed to debate and immediately adopt both of the underlying measures.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), my good friend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the time.

Where I come from in Ohio, trade is a four-letter word, J-O-B-S. Unfortunately, the President, the United States Trade Representative, and the

Republican leadership do not spell very well. They ought to simply look around.

Since President Bush has taken office, we have lost 3 million jobs in this country. We have lost 2.1 million manufacturing jobs in this country.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I would simply say one of the reasons we have not been able to have these job opportunities is the lack of this authority that has been put into place. We now for the first time are going to have markets opening up so that the four-letter word in Ohio that is so important, J-O-B-S, will, in fact, be enhanced; and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his comments.

I think that any reasonable people, if we would simply go home and talk to workers, talk to people, they will say that the anxiety they feel so often is because of our trade policy. These 3 million jobs we have lost, these 2.1 million manufacturing jobs are because of an economic program of tax cuts where a millionaire gets a tax cut of \$93,000 and children and their families get nothing and families making 15 and 20 and \$25,000 a year, a Bush economic program that cuts benefits for health care, cuts benefits for education, cuts benefits for veterans, and these trade agreements, trade agreement after trade agreement after trade agreement, have cost American jobs.

I look around. Last Sunday, there was a rally at a Goodyear plant in Akron, Ohio, in my district. Goodyear has only 14 factories in the United States left, one of the biggest rubber companies in the world. Most of their plants now are overseas. We had rallies at each of these 14 plants simultaneously, and I walked around before speaking at this rally, and these workers get it.

They understand the reason their jobs have gone overseas and those tires are made overseas and sold back into the United States. They understand that the failure of our economic policy lies at the feet of the failure of our trade policy. They understand that NAFTA took a surplus with Mexico and Canada in 1993 and has turned it into a \$25 billion trade deficit. They understand that our China policy, with a \$100 million trade surplus only a dozen years ago, \$100 million with an "M," now is a \$100 billion trade deficit with that country.

President Bush, Sr., used to say that \$1 billion of trade turned into 18,000 jobs. If we have a \$1 billion trade surplus, we have a net gain of 18,000 jobs. If we have a trade deficit of \$1 billion, we have a net loss of 18,000 jobs. Our China policy alone has turned basically a neutral job situation into 1.8 million

jobs lost every year just because of our bilateral trade situation with China, 1.8 million jobs every year; and most of those jobs are good paying manufacturing jobs.

Mexico has about 400, 500,000 jobs every year, Mexico-Canada trade deficit. Goodyear workers understand that. Steelworkers in Ohio and across the country understand that. Auto workers understand that. People who work with their hands understand that these trade agreements hemorrhage jobs.

Two years ago, even Congress understood it when we passed the Jordan trade agreement. The Jordan trade agreement lifted people up, did not pull standards down. It lifted labor standards up. It lifted environmental standards up. It lifted food safety standards up, but Congress seems to have forgotten that lesson of Jordan. Hence, today, we consider Chile and we consider Singapore.

These are two agreements that do not lift standards up. They pull standards down. They will cost American jobs. They will weaken American labor standards. They will weaken America in world and environmental standards.

Let me just briefly, Mr. Speaker, take two issues to show that with Chile, people say Chile has decent labor standards. They do today, but under this agreement, unlike the Jordan agreement, where the Jordan agreement said labor standards are determined by ILO, International Labor Organization, standards, with Chile, Chile under this agreement gets to enforce its own labor standards. They may be pretty good labor standards today; but if we get a majority in the Chilean government like the majority in this country, we will have effective pressure to weaken labor law, as my friends on the other side of the aisle do here.

□ 1200

So Chile will see a weakening of labor and environmental law, and then we will see a weakening of labor and environmental standards under this trade agreement. If Chile had ILO labor standards, that would not be the case.

The second issue is, under Jordan, we got rid of the Chapter 11 investor state provisions, which, unfortunately, under NAFTA, allows corporations to sue foreign governments, shifting sovereignty from a democratically-elected government to corporate interests where a corporation can sue a government for passing a public health law or a food safety or an environmental law, weakening those laws that governments democratically attain.

We should reject Chile and Singapore. We should go back to the Jordan model. We should reject Chile today, we should reject the Singapore agreement today, and we should go back to the Jordan model. The Jordan model lifts standards. It lifts people up rather than pulling people down. It is good for the environment, it is good for labor, it is good for food safety, and it is good for American values.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have the highest regard for my friend from Ohio, but I want to make a couple of brief comments about the statements he made.

First, at the outset, he talked about this being a Republican leadership effort. Yes, Republicans have provided leadership, but I think it will be very clear that strong bipartisan support, Democrats and Republicans alike, will be embracing both the Chile and the Singapore Free Trade Agreements, realizing what opportunities they will create.

At the close of the gentleman's remarks he talked about lifting standards, and I completely concur with that. I believe very passionately that the best way, the most effective way to lift standards, and I appreciate his acknowledging that those labor standards are already high in Chile, the best way to do that is for us to enhance the economic standing of those people who are seeking the opportunity to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder.

So I just wanted to say that I disagree with some of the conclusions that my friend might have drawn, but I think we do share the exact same goal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tucson, Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), my very able colleague who in 1987 asked me to join him as an original cosponsor of the legislation to obliterate tariffs among Canada, the United States, and Mexico so we could have a Free Trade Agreement. We have seen, with the NAFTA, a tripling of trade from 1993 to today, and he has been a great leader on trade issues and I enjoy working with him.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his kind comments, but I would have to say there has been no person in this House who has been a better advocate, a stronger advocate, a more forceful and articulate advocate of trade and the advantages it brings to American workers and American consumers than the person who just spoke, my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this rule, and I rise in strong support of the underlying trade agreements with Chile and Singapore. I was delighted to see my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) saying he supports the rule as well. He spoke about some of the concerns he has. These concerns are ones of process, concern that there is not the ability to amend these bills on the floor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was, of course, the debate that we had on Trade Promotion Authority, what we used to call Fast Track. That is not the issue here today. The issue here today is the substance of these two agreements, and the substance of these two agreements is indeed very good.

This a momentous occasion in our trade policy. Passage of these two

trade agreements is the first time in a decade we have been able to use what we used to call Fast Track, now called Trade Promotion Authority, to get agreements. It will once again mean that the United States is aggressively pursuing its national interest, breaking down trade barriers and building a world of free trade. I commend the leadership of the administration and the Congress, both sides of the Capitol and both sides of the aisle, for bringing us to this point.

I have a special reason for feeling very emotional about the Chile Free Trade Agreement. Eight years ago, in 1995, just shortly after NAFTA went into effect, the Speaker of the House asked me to go to Chile and talk to them about trade. I went there and I said I had a good deal of confidence that then President Clinton would seek Trade Promotion Authority, Fast Track Authority, and Congress would give it to him. Of course we know that that did not happen. And it was not until just last year that Trade Promotion Authority was granted the President. Now we are finally back on track.

There has been so many dashed hopes in Chile, so much anticipation of what this could mean for them, and finally we are bringing it to fruition. Since the launching of these negotiations it has been a period of great unease in Chile, of anticipation as we struggled to secure TPA. All of Latin America has been watching the progression of Trade Promotion Authority, and now this agreement with Chile. For them it is the litmus test to verify that the U.S. would not renege on its commitment to the Western Hemisphere, and today Congress fulfills that commitment by moving forward.

If we are to nurture fragile democracies in the region, if we are to foster development, development that actually leads to sustained better economic conditions for people in the region, as well as for Americans and consumers and workers in this country, we have to lead by example. We have to lead by bringing free trade to the region. Chile is that first step. It is an agreement that is in our economic, our foreign policy, our national security interest.

More than 85 percent of bilateral trade in consumer and industrial products will immediately become duty free upon ratification, with most remaining tariffs eliminated within 4 years. Chile is offering new access for U.S. financial service companies, telecommunications, express delivery services, and professional service advisers.

For Singapore, this is the first free trade agreement with an East Asian country. Singapore has expressed its early and unequivocal support for the United States and its war on terrorism following the events of September 11. Their support has been unwavering since that time.

And when it comes to business and commercial interests, Singapore is the biggest customer we have in Southeast

Asia. We now have investments in that city state that total \$23 billion, and our exports to Singapore are \$18 billion. So there is no doubt that the Singapore Free Trade Agreement is in the broad U.S. national interest. It will enhance our mutual interest in a stable, prosperous ASEAN and East Asia.

I believe these agreements will stand as models for other bilateral trade agreements and their regions and in multilateral forms. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the passage of legislation implementing these important agreements.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I stand today to speak for the heartland of America. My Congressional district runs for about 300 miles along the edge of the Ohio River, bordering Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Kentucky. In one of my counties the unemployment rate is 11.4 percent, and in the City of Youngstown, Ohio, the unemployment rate is 18.2 percent.

Now, I have heard some of my colleagues express concern for those who live in Chile, and I am not insensitive to the needs of the folks in Chile, but I think our first obligation is to look after the folks right here in the good old USA.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRICKLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I totally agree, I totally agree with the statement my friend has just made. I believe our number one priority should be U.S. workers, U.S. producers, U.S. manufacturers. That should be our top priority, recognizing the benefits of opening up new markets for them.

Our goal here, as I mentioned earlier, is with the elimination of the luxury tax in Chile we will be able to export more U.S. manufactured automobiles into the Chile market and that is why this will be a win-win.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. We heard that same rhetoric about NAFTA. Does anyone seriously believe that NAFTA has been good for this country? The people that I represent, who are without work, do not believe that NAFTA has been good for this country.

What about the WTO, this body that tries to dictate policy for those of us who serve in this body? We have been elected by Americans to represent Americans, and in these trade deals, sadly, it seems to me that we are taking the authority that is invested in us through the Constitution and the responsibilities that we have as elected representatives and we are giving that responsibility to an external international organization.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman once again yield?

Mr. STRICKLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me to respond quickly to one point he made.

The gentleman said how can anyone talk about the benefits of the North American Free Trade Agreement, and I would say to my friend that in 1993 trade between Mexico and the United States was roughly \$83 billion. Last year, trade between Mexico and the United States was \$232 billion.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Reclaiming my time, please, Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge that the gentleman's statistics are correct, but what has happened with trade between this country and Mexico? The imbalance has increased dramatically in their favor. I recognize that these trade agreements encourage trade, but what is it doing to our companies, our workers, our communities? Other countries are in fact benefiting, and I will acknowledge that, but what is happening to our communities?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield on that point, I think we have to realize that imports are very good and important for the United States of America. We have the standard of living that we do today because the world does have access to our consumer market.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Reclaiming my time once again, Mr. Speaker, I sat in the living room of one of my constituents not long ago and he looked at the television and he said, "Congressman, I would be willing to pay \$50 more or \$100 more for a TV if I could buy one that was manufactured in America by my neighbors." That is what is happening to us.

Are consumers getting cheaper goods? Well, I suppose they are. At what cost? What is happening to this country, and I just urge my colleagues to look at the record and to reject these agreements. And I thank my colleague for the dialogue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. May I inquire of the Speaker the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 16½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) had 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, only to add to the debate that the distinguished chairman was having with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

There are other things that happened. I voted for NAFTA, Mr. Chairman, and I thought when I did that it would help in many ways. I pointed out to the gentleman last night, and I guess we could cite a lot of things, but the tomato industry in Florida was destroyed ultimately by NAFTA, accounting for the fact that there was a freeze that took place roughly around

the same time. But the dumping is what was the death knell.

In addition, I genuinely thought in the maquiladoras that there was going to be environmental improvement. I have been down there, and there has not been substantial environmental improvement. And I have talked with a significant number of people from Mexico regarding wages, and I do find that there are still problems with reference to their hourly rate.

But I will make the point that the one good thing NAFTA did was get rid of one-party rule in Mexico. But one-party rule or two-party rule does not account for the fact that the workers are not improving.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I appreciate his engaging me on this issue.

We did have a nice discussion upstairs in the Committee on Rules last night on this issue, and I was proud to underscore the fact that bringing about economic liberalizations through greater trade did in fact lead to political liberalization and to one-party rule.

My friend has raised the issue of tomatoes, and I appreciate his acknowledging the freeze and the impact that that had on the tomato industry in Florida. One of the challenges I have found, Mr. Speaker, is that there are many people who like to blame every single ailment of society on the North American Free Trade Agreement. I would argue that while I know that there have been great challenges that the tomato industry has faced in Florida, it is important for us to realize that being able to compete in the global marketplace is a priority. And I am not here in this job, and I do not believe we as policymakers should have the protection of one industry over another as a priority.

□ 1215

And so I believe that quite frankly it may not have been the mere existence of the North American Free Trade Agreement that created the challenges that have existed in that area. Many in agriculture have made this claim to us that it is NAFTA that created this, that NAFTA is responsible for that. It is clearly because of the fact that the world has had ready access to the U.S. consumer market.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Most respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I would reclaim my time. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but I labored through that with agricultural interests in Florida; and I think that we could point significantly to the North American Free Trade Agreement as causative of our concern. I suggest to him that when CAFTA ultimately comes that he and I will have a very similar, but even more vigorous, debate.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. I look forward to that. And we want to work very closely on that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), a leader in this arena as well as of our caucus.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the most troubling part of this debate for me is that with the trade agreements that we have signed, and no one discounts the importance of trade to this country and to the world economy, that we continue to see that Americans subsidize this trade policy with the loss of their good-wage jobs.

We are told time and again, as we were just recently this week, in the Wall Street Journal that those jobs are not coming back. This is not a question of losing your job in recession because of a slow economic time in manufacturing and then you get called back to your workplace. You are not going to get called back because your job has left the country. We said at the beginning of this trade debate some 15 or 20 years ago that the low-paid jobs, the not-so-good jobs were the jobs that would go overseas and because of increased trade and because of our intellectual capacity and our ingenuity that Americans would get the good jobs, that the hot, heavy, dirty jobs would go overseas, the low-wage jobs would go overseas.

But now what we see is that, in fact, middle-class jobs are leaving America to go overseas and in many instances what I am certain people would consider the high-wage jobs, as we were told again in the Wall Street Journal this week, are going overseas. \$60,000-a-year software-writing jobs, computer engineering jobs are being sent overseas where they can be done for \$5,000 a year. It is just an economic swap. You simply have a job that you have here in California or Minnesota or Florida and you decide that this job you are paying for, as IBM did, you paid \$60,000 for this job, you can have it done in India for \$5,000; and that is simply an economic equation and it makes a lot of sense. It is just not very good for middle America.

These trade agreements continue to be an assault on middle America. What I do not understand is why we insist that that be the case. Because I think it is clear that we can have expanded trade, we can open up markets, we can open up markets for American products and services and talent and at the same time hold onto these jobs. What we now see is in every industry those high-wage jobs are being traded in for low-wage jobs. It is true in steel. It is true in the automobile industry. You say, well, that is old-fashioned jobs; that is an old-fashioned industry. No,

what is old-fashioned about those industries is they had middle-class jobs. You could buy a house, you could buy a car, you could send your kid to school. That is what was old-fashioned about them. And even on the cutting edge of technology, in the steel industry or the automobile industry, they are being sent overseas, even from other countries. We are doing it in insurance and financial services and computer engineering and software-writing.

The point is this, that the first generation of this trade agreement was we wanted to open up Chinese markets so we could sell into the Chinese market. Now what we see is the next generation of cutting-edge technology and cutting-edge countries not just from the United States but from all over the world that are going to China for the purposes of exporting. Those are jobs that are leaving here. Those are middle-class jobs. That is the assault on middle-class jobs. As long as we do not rise up and give workers the right to organize in other countries, then it is a fiction. It is a fiction that somehow we are going to protect American jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I would like to make is a very clear one. We want to focus on middle-class jobs. We want to do everything that we can to enhance opportunities for U.S. workers in the manufacturing sector of our economy. That is why this Chile agreement will be very beneficial. Why? Under this agreement, Chile's government agrees to eliminate the auto luxury tax that exists there. What does that mean? It means that there will be enhanced opportunity for U.S. auto manufacturers and those middle-class workers that does not exist today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. The question is, from what platform will those automobiles be made? The gentleman is suggesting that they are going to be made in Detroit and shipped to Chile. I am suggesting, no, it is more likely they are going to be made in Argentina or they are going to be made in Mexico or they are going to be made in Germany than they are going to be made in the United States. I appreciate that they will have access to the automobile market.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I will tell him, they can be made in Argentina today and get in there tariff free because of the agreement that exists between Chile and Argentina. All we are saying with this agreement is, let us create the potential so Detroit autoworkers will have a chance to get into that market.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If I could take back the balance of my time, the point is the fastest-growing

group in the United States, the fastest-growing organization is unemployed Americans looking for jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), the cochair of the Chile coalition working group who has led the effort to ensure that we get this agreement to the floor today and has counted votes and worked very hard on it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and of the underlying bills, H.R. 2638 and H.R. 2639, the U.S.-Chile and the U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreements. They are both outstanding agreements that are worthy of our support.

We have heard a great deal of talk right here on the floor today and during the week from opponents of these agreements who talk about everything but the agreements themselves. They talk about unemployed Americans. They talk about damage to the environment. They talk about waves of immigration. There is no doubt that these problems exist. But there is also no doubt that these problems are not about the issue at hand. The issue at hand is whether to approve implementing legislation for two particular agreements, the U.S.-Chile and U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreements, not the NAFTA, not a CAFTA, and not an FTAA. We are not voting today on models for future agreements. The Trade Promotion Authority that Congress granted the President last year provides the road map for future agreements and negotiations. And future agreements will have to come up to Congress for future votes.

What we are talking about today are the merits of these two individual agreements and the benefits they will bring to our businesses and our workers. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues in the hours remaining before we cast our votes to just take a few moments to look at the specific merits of these two agreements with the two key partners in Asia and Latin America. Mr. Speaker, you will find that they expand market access opportunities for U.S. manufacturers, farmers, and service providers. You will find that they secure extensive protection for U.S. companies' intellectual property rights and investment, and you will find that they provide strong labor and environmental protections.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the Chile and Singapore free trade agreements.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Chile and Singapore free trade agreements. The Chile Free Trade Agreement will eliminate tariffs on 85 percent of U.S. exports to Chile immediately. The Singapore Free Trade Agreement eliminates Singapore's few remaining tariffs to U.S. goods and locks in Singapore's tariff-free treatment of U.S. imports.

Under the U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement, American workers, consumers, businesses and farmers will enjoy preferential access to a small, but fast-growing, economy, enabling trade with no tariffs and under streamlined customs procedures. Over 75 percent of U.S. farm goods, including pork, beef, wheat, soybeans, feed grains, and potatoes will enter Chile duty free within 4 years. All other duties on U.S. agriculture products will be phased out over 12 years. U.S. farmers' access to Chilean markets will be as good or better than our competitors' in Chile. This will help reverse the gains Canada and Europe achieved in market share after implementing their free trade agreements with Chile.

In light of the previous debate going on, I fail to understand how we can contend that American workers will benefit by denying our workers the opportunity to compete, in this case in Chile and in Singapore, for the jobs which is exactly what we have been doing, because other countries have negotiated free trade agreements with Chile and with Singapore. We have denied our workers the opportunity to compete. With 96 percent of the world's consumers living outside the United States, we must continually look to expanding our markets outside the United States and, yes, working for fair trade agreements.

While U.S. tariffs will also be eliminated over time under the free trade agreement, the agreement has a provision that will help protect farmers and ranchers from sudden surges in imports of designated agricultural products from Chile. That is a key ingredient. The agricultural safeguard provision will apply to imports of certain Chilean products, including many canned fruits, frozen concentrated orange juice, tomato products and avocados. The safeguard is price-based and automatic. The prices for the commodities subject to safeguards will be programmed into the U.S. Customs Service computers, which will automatically assess the tariff uplift if the import value of the commodity falls below the trigger. I think this is an exciting component of this agreement.

Quickly on Singapore, it guarantees zero tariffs immediately on all U.S. goods, and the FTA ensures that Singapore cannot increase its duties on any U.S. product.

In conclusion, both the Chile and Singapore free trade agreements provide benefits for the United States by lowering duties on exports to Chile and locking in duty-free treatment for U.S. goods to Singapore. Both agreements

also include innovative provisions on transparency and customs facilitation that will help promote full implementation of these agreements and further respect for the rule of law.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support implementation of the Chile and Singapore free trade agreements.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that my friend's statement is right on target. I would like to congratulate him on a couple of points that he made. First of all, realizing that 90 percent of the world's consumers are outside of U.S. borders. What that means is that as 150 countries have embarked on these free trade agreements and we have been a party to only three of them, we have been left behind the eight ball. I know my California colleague (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) was talking about workers. I see my friend from Toledo here who is about to speak. We all are focused on jobs and workers. Obviously, the agriculture sector of our economy is a critically important job creator; and I believe that, as my friend has pointed out, creating a chance to get into Chile's market along with dealing with surge safeguards so that we are not seeing a disproportionate negative impact on the United States will in fact inure to the benefit of workers here.

I thank my friend and appreciate his service as cochair along with me with the U.S.-Mexico caucus, underscoring the benefits of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. STENHOLM. In the remaining part of the minute that the gentleman yielded to me so that I could yield back to him, I would return the compliment and also commend him for continuing to emphasize jobs, workers, environmental issues, which are all going to have to be more seriously addressed in all future agreements. We both agree on that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to see what the California wine growers think about this measure. Maybe the chairman will describe that on his time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), a new Member of Congress and a leader in this field.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the Chile and Singapore trade agreements. I oppose these bills because of the inadequate labor provisions embodied in both. These agreements yet again point to the fact that the Bush administration is determined to undermine not only worker protections here in the United States but also abroad as well.

Under the current language of these bills, only one workers' rights provision is enforceable through dispute settlement, the obligation that a country enforce its own labor laws no matter how weak these labor laws may be. These FTAs give each country involved the option to gut their current labor laws to gain a trade advantage and face no consequences at all.

The FTA with Jordan proved that a trade agreement could win the support of labor, but to do so it needs to contain a commitment that each country follow the guidelines set forth in the International Labor Organization's core labor standards.

□ 1230

The trade agreements before us today are a gigantic step backwards and are vehemently opposed by labor groups. Why in our current economic situation are we putting American workers at risk? Is it not enough that the unemployment rate has skyrocketed to 6.4 percent? Is it not enough that the Bush administration has presided over the loss of 3 million private sector jobs, has failed to raise the minimum wage, allowing millions of older workers to lose half of their private pension benefits, and has denied unemployment benefits to millions of workers who exhausted their Federal unemployment workers benefits? One would think so but apparently that is not the case.

My other concern is that these FTAs create new immigration policy in the context of a free trade agreement. This is a step into uncharted territory. The fact is there is no specific authority in the Trade Act of 2002 to negotiate new visa categories or impose new requirements on the current temporary entry system, but that is exactly what has been done in the negotiations of these two agreements. I urge my colleagues to vote no on both agreements.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and I welcome her to this body. I know she is a new Member here. I would say that the conclusions that have been drawn I believe are totally inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a new Member of Congress and a leader in this arena.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time to talk about this very important issue, and I rise against the rule as well.

The issue of agricultural products came up a little earlier. The products that we are going to get into Chile are going to be subsidized products from our government and in turn preventing a lot of the African countries from

being able to trade also and being able to compete on an international market.

We all understand comparative advantage and I think we all understand the concept of free trade and I do not want to say for one second that I am not for trade. I think trade is a good thing. But what I cannot understand is why we would have this Jordan agreement which would have us able to enforce environmental standards and labor standards with the same capacity as commercial standards. We are rolling back these provisions in this agreement. And as much as we want to export our products, we want to export the ideals. And regardless of what party we belong to, we agree that in the last century in this country we made great strides in human progress with the labor movement, with the environmental movement, with the raising of living standards in this country, and I think we are getting away from that.

I would like to share with the gentleman from California, and I have enormous respect for him and his staff, an article by Lou Dobbs in which, talking about free trade, he said, "The proof is in the numbers: The U.S. account deficit, the broadest measure of transactions with other nations, swelled to \$503 billion in 2002. That is not the way it was supposed to work. Increased global trade was supposed to lead to better jobs and higher standards of living by opening markets around the world for U.S. goods. Now some people, myself included, are rethinking the belief that free trade benefits all nations."

I think it is inaccurate to say that we think that somehow these manufacturing jobs are going to move back into northeast Ohio or go back to Detroit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. And the case I would make is I think that Mr. Dobbs is wrong in coming to the conclusion that he has, but that is what the debate is all about.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think it shows a trend, though, to the gentleman from California, that there are many people who bought into the program in the early 1990s who are no longer agreeing with it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and ask him to yield to me.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the point that needs to be made is that with this agreement, we are focused. The gentleman talks about the rollback of the Jordan agreement. That was a separate agreement. This is an agreement that was struck between the leaders of Chile and the United

States and the leaders of Singapore and the United States. The fact is we are enhancing living standards through greater trade, greater opportunities for that free flow of goods and services. And on those jobs that you talked about, the auto sector, I believe that by the elimination of the luxury tax in Chile we create a chance for his auto workers to have a chance there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time because it is running out, there is no way we can say with a straight face that it does not pass the snicker test to think manufacturing jobs are going to come back into Ohio or anywhere in the industrial Midwest because we signed this agreement. If we are so committed to the labor standards, why are we rolling back the five principled stances of the International Labor Organization which were in the Jordan agreement? This is prohibition of slavery, nondiscrimination of employment, child labor, freedom of association. We are taking that out.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the main reason is that those circumstances do not exist in Chile. It is not necessary. It is not necessary to address those issues.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Then why not put them in?

Mr. DREIER. That is why they do not have to be there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Chair, since the gentleman from California has more time, if he is inclined to yield time on his side.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of the Chair how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the cochair of the Singapore effort to bring about success on the floor here, my very good friend and able colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Also, he and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) are heading up this great effort from the Republican side to make sure that we work with the administration on this important effort for free trade agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Singapore effort because I believe it is in the best interest of America. It is in the best interest of Singapore. These are two great nations who

not only work with each other but have so much in common. This free trade agreement is going to do things which will help both countries, most specifically as it deals with intellectual property and the way we deal with each other to resolve disputes.

Singapore is going to adopt as a result of this free trade agreement laws which are the same or similar to the United States so that our companies, people who do business back and forth, have an opportunity to look at the same type of legal system in the resolution of disputes.

As was noted on June 10, Tom Lipscomb wrote in the Wall Street Journal: "Entertainment content is now [America's] largest export, and information is the basis of more than half of gross domestic product" of America. We need to make sure intellectual property, we need to make sure that the content that is a valuable asset of United States of America has an opportunity to have a free and open day in court wherever we sell these intellectual property possessions that the United States has.

Singapore is a good friend of America. We are going to find that as we work through free trade agreements that this will become the gold standard as we deal with other places all around the globe.

I support the free trade agreement with Singapore. I thank the gentleman from California for his expert leadership and his vision in making sure that with our President that we have friends all around the globe that enjoy the same opportunities that we do in America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), whose district I had the good fortune of visiting and could see firsthand some of the pain of previous free trade agreements.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the opportunity to urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule which restricts debate today to 2 hours, as has happened on every so-called free trade agreement that has come before this body in the last 20 years. Restricted time means no opportunity to really take a look at what has happened.

Many of us have served here long enough to know that the NAFTA idea of trade does not work. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my good friend, you told me when you voted for NAFTA back in 1993 it would create jobs. In fact, it has done exactly the opposite. We have historic trade deficits with Mexico, this year alone close to \$50 billion.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I am sorry, I will not yield. You have only given me 2 minutes under your limited rule, as millions of people in this country lose

their jobs and lose their futures. There is so much suffering we can lay to your hands as one of those who voted for NAFTA in 1993. I want you to meet the people who have lost their jobs all over this country, over 3 million people just in the last 3 years alone.

Look at NAFTA and these trade deficits. You told us in 1993 that this template for trade, which you now want to extend to Singapore and to Chile, would work, that it would give us jobs. It has been just the reverse. Our jobs have been cashed out, and Mexico has turned into an export platform to the United States, and the wages of Mexico's people have been cut by half. By half! You have hurt people in both countries due to those who voted for NAFTA. So we now have lost jobs and growing trade deficits. You told us our trade accounts would be better. We now have half a trillion dollars of trade debt in this country. One million lost jobs alone this year are related to that half a trillion in deficit and every year in the last 10 years, deeper and deeper deficit, more lost jobs. Your plan is not working. We have trade deficits, not surpluses, and we have job losses not jobs created. In my home community of Toledo, unemployment now is 10 percent. Every year it gets worse and the Fed has invented a new term, "jobless recovery." What is that?

And, finally, on China after PNTR, we experienced huge trade deficits with more lost jobs. Your record is indefensible. Vote no on this Singapore and Chile expansion of the NAFTA trade template. It has not worked before, and it surely will not work now.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to close the debate myself, and I hope my colleague from Toledo will stay here because I plan to close the debate and respond to some of the statements that were just made. So I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to close the debate here, and then I will be moving the previous question. So if the gentleman will complete his statement.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 28, nays 389, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

#### YEAS—28

Baird	Hastings (FL)	Scott (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Slaughter
Capuano	Kaptur	Solis
Carson (OK)	Kennedy (RI)	Strickland
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Towns
Conyers	McDermott	Velazquez
DeFazio	Payne	Waters
Doggett	Rangel	Woolsey
Filner	Sandin	
Grijalva	Schakowsky	

#### NAYS—389

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Hulshof
Ackerman	Davis (TN)	Hunter
Aderholt	Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde
Akin	Davis, Tom	Inslee
Allen	Deal (GA)	Isakson
Andrews	Delahunt	Israel
Baca	DeLauro	Issa
Bachus	DeLay	Istook
Baker	DeMint	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	Deutsch	Jackson-Lee
Ballance	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart, M.	Janklow
Barrett (SC)	Dicks	Jefferson
Bartlett (MD)	Dingell	Jenkins
Barton (TX)	Dooley (CA)	John
Bass	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Beauprez	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Becerra	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bell	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Bereuter	Dunn	Jones (OH)
Berman	Edwards	Kanjorski
Berry	Ehlers	Keller
Biggert	Emanuel	Kelly
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kennedy (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Kildee
Blackburn	English	Kilpatrick
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Kind
Blunt	Etheridge	King (IA)
Boehlert	Everett	King (NY)
Boehner	Farr	Kingston
Bonilla	Feeney	Kirk
Bonner	Flake	Klecza
Bono	Foley	Kline
Boozman	Forbes	Knollenberg
Boswell	Fossella	Kolbe
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Boyd	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Bradley (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Frost	Langevin
Brady (TX)	Gallely	Lantos
Brown (OH)	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Brown (SC)	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Brown, Corrine	Gibbons	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Ginny	Gillmor	Leach
Burgess	Gingrey	Lee
Burns	Gonzalez	Levin
Burr	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Gordon	Linder
Calvert	Goss	Lipinski
Camp	Granger	LoBiondo
Cannon	Graves	Lofgren
Cantor	Green (TX)	Lowe
Capito	Green (WI)	Lucas (KY)
Capps	Gutierrez	Lucas (OK)
Cardin	Gutknecht	Lynch
Cardoza	Hall	Majette
Carson (IN)	Harman	Maloney
Carter	Harris	Manzullo
Case	Hart	Markey
Castle	Hastings (WA)	Marshall
Chabot	Hayes	Matheson
Chocola	Hayworth	Matsui
Clay	Hefley	McCarthy (MO)
Coble	Hensarling	McCarthy (NY)
Cole	Herger	McCollum
Collins	Hill	McCotter
Cooper	Hinchey	McCrery
Costello	Hinojosa	McGovern
Cramer	Hobson	McHugh
Crane	Hoefel	McInnis
Crenshaw	Hoekstra	McIntyre
Crowley	Holden	McKeon
Cubin	Holt	McNulty
Culberson	Honda	Meehan
Cummings	Hoolley (OR)	Meek (FL)
Cunningham	Hostettler	Meeks (NY)
Davis (AL)	Houghton	Menendez
Davis (FL)	Hoyer	Mica

Michaud	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
Millender-	Pryce (OH)	Snyder
McDonald	Putnam	Souder
Miller (FL)	Quinn	Spratt
Miller (MI)	Radanovich	Stark
Miller (NC)	Rahall	Stearns
Miller, Gary	Ramstad	Stenholm
Miller, George	Regula	Stupak
Mollohan	Rehberg	Sweeney
Moore	Renzi	Tancredo
Moran (KS)	Reynolds	Tanner
Moran (VA)	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Murphy	Rogers (AL)	Tauzin
Murtha	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Musgrave	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Myrick	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Nadler	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Neal (MA)	Rothman	Thornberry
Nethercutt	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Neugebauer	Royce	Tiberi
Ney	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Northup	Rush	Toomey
Norwood	Ryan (OH)	Turner (OH)
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Turner (TX)
Nussle	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Oberstar	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Obey	Sanchez, Linda	Upton
Oliver	T.	Van Hollen
Ortiz	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Osborne	Sanders	Vitter
Ose	Saxton	Walden (OR)
Otter	Schiff	Walsh
Owens	Schrock	Wamp
Oxley	Scott (VA)	Watson
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Pascarell	Serrano	Waxman
Pastor	Sessions	Weiner
Paul	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Pearce	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Pelosi	Shays	Weller
Pence	Sherman	Wexler
Peterson (MN)	Sherwood	Whitfield
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Wicker
Petri	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Pitts	Simmons	Wilson (SC)
Platts	Simpson	Wolf
Pombo	Skelton	Wu
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)	Wynn
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Portman	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—17

Alexander	Evans	Greenwood
Berkley	Fattah	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Reyes
Cox	Fletcher	Sullivan
Davis (CA)	Ford	Taylor (NC)
DeGette	Gephardt	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1302

Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FARR, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

# PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2738, UNITED STATES-CHILE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, AND H.R. 2739, UNITED STATES-SINGAPORE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair clarify for me and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)

has 30 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I have but 30 seconds, and I would first compliment the majority. I think that the exchange during the Committee on Rules debate on these two rules was a spirited one; and it signifies, among other things, part of the division in the House. On the floor, there were spirited exchanges between the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and me; and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); and between the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I think it points out the significance of these two agreements. They are really important for all of us; and as I said, this was demonstrated in the Committee on Rules and here on the floor.

There are other trade agreements that are coming down the pike, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and I have had discussions regarding the fact that I am hopeful that in the future we will have even more time for even more spirited debate. These are important measures, and I would urge Members to pay strict attention to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Chamber is not packed to hear my words for the next 2 minutes, so I will simply say that I believe we have a wonderful opportunity to open up new markets for U.S. workers in both Chile and Singapore. This agreement is going to enjoy broad bipartisan support. I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” for the rule and “yes” for the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution or on any other questions that may arise during this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 200, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—226

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Osborne
Akin	Gillmor	Ose
Bachus	Gingrey	Otter
Baker	Goode	Oxley
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Goss	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Pence
Barton (TX)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Green (WI)	Petri
Beauprez	Greenwood	Pickering
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Pitts
Biggett	Harris	Platts
Bilirakis	Hart	Pombo
Blackburn	Hastings (FL)	Porter
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Boehrlert	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hayworth	Putnam
Bonilla	Hefley	Quinn
Bonner	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bono	Herger	Ramstad
Boozman	Hobson	Regula
Bradley (NH)	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Houghton	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hyde	Rogers (MI)
Burns	Isakson	Rohrabacher
Burr	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Istook	Royce
Buyer	Janklow	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Jenkins	Ryun (KS)
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Cannon	Johnson (IL)	Schrock
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Carter	Keller	Shadegg
Castle	Kelly	Shaw
Chabot	Kennedy (MN)	Shays
Chocola	King (IA)	Sherwood
Coble	King (NY)	Shuster
Cole	Kingston	Simmons
Collins	Kirk	Simpson
Cox	Kline	Smith (MI)
Crane	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cubin	LaHood	Souder
Culberson	Latham	Stearns
Cunningham	LaTourette	Stenholm
Davis, Jo Ann	Leach	Sweeney
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
DeLay	Linder	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	LoBiondo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Thornberry
Doolittle	McCotter	Tiahrt
Dreier	McCrery	Tiberi
Duncan	McHugh	Toomey
Dunn	McInnis	Turner (OH)
Ehlers	McKeon	Upton
Emerson	Mica	Vitter
English	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
Everett	Miller (MI)	Walsh
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Flake	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Fletcher	Murphy	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Musgrave	Weller
Forbes	Myrick	Whitfield
Fossella	Nethercutt	Wicker
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Wilson (SC)
Gallely	Northup	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Norwood	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Nunes	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Nussle	

## NOES—200

Abercrombie	Boyd	Davis (AL)
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)
Alexander	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Capps	Davis (TN)
Baca	Capuano	DeFazio
Baird	Cardin	DeGette
Baldwin	Cardoza	Delahunt
Ballance	Carson (IN)	DeLauro
Becerra	Carson (OK)	Deutsch
Bell	Case	Dicks
Berman	Clay	Dingell
Berry	Clyburn	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Dooley (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Doyle
Blumenauer	Cramer	Edwards
Boswell	Crowley	Emanuel
Boucher	Cummings	Engel

Eshoo Lofgren  
 Etheridge Lowey  
 Evans Lucas (KY)  
 Farr Lynch  
 Fattah Majette  
 Filner Maloney  
 Frank (MA) Markey  
 Frost Marshall  
 Gonzalez Matheson  
 Gordon Matsui  
 Green (TX) McCarthy (MO)  
 Grijalva McCarthy (NY)  
 Gutierrez McCollum  
 Hall McDermott  
 Harman McGovern  
 Hill McIntyre  
 Hinchey McNulty  
 Hinojosa Meehan  
 Hoeffel Meek (FL)  
 Holden Meeks (NY)  
 Holt Menendez  
 Honda Michaud  
 Hooley (OR) Millender  
 Hoyer McDonald  
 Inslee Miller (NC)  
 Israel Miller, George  
 Jackson (IL) Mollohan  
 Jackson-Lee Moore  
 (TX) Moran (VA)  
 Jefferson Murtha  
 John Nadler  
 Johnson, E. B. Napolitano  
 Jones (OH) Neal (MA)  
 Kanjorski Oberstar  
 Kaptur Obey  
 Kennedy (RI) Oliver  
 Kildee Ortiz  
 Kilpatrick Owens  
 Kind Pallone  
 Kleczka Pascrell  
 Kucinich Pastor  
 Lampson Payne  
 Langevin Pelosi  
 Lantos Peterson (MN)  
 Larsen (WA) Pomeroy  
 Larson (CT) Price (NC)  
 Lee Rahall  
 Levin Rangel  
 Lewis (GA) Reyes  
 Lipinski Rodriguez Wynn

## NOT VOTING—8

Berkley Ferguson Shimkus  
 Bishop (UT) Ford Sullivan  
 Conyers Gephardt

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1325

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida moves to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

## MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 201, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

## AYES—223

Aderholt Gibbons Nussle  
 Akin Gilchrist Osborne  
 Bachus Gillmor Ose  
 Baker Gingrey Otter  
 Ballenger Goode Oxley  
 Barrett (SC) Goodlatte Paul  
 Bartlett (MD) Goss Pence  
 Barton (TX) Granger Peterson (PA)  
 Bass Graves Petri  
 Beauprez Green (WI) Pickering  
 Bereuter Greenwood Pitts  
 Biggert Gutknecht Platts  
 Bilirakis Harris Pombo  
 Blackburn Hart Porter  
 Blunt Hastings (WA) Portman  
 Boehlert Hayes Pryce (OH)  
 Boehner Hayworth Putnam  
 Bonilla Hefley Quinn  
 Bonner Hensarling Radanovich  
 Bono Herger Ramstad  
 Boozman Hobson Regula  
 Bradley (NH) Hoekstra Rehberg  
 Brady (TX) Hostettler Renzi  
 Brown (SC) Houghton Reynolds  
 Brown-Waite, Hulshof Rogers (AL)  
 Ginny Hunter Rogers (KY)  
 Burgess Hyde Rogers (MI)  
 Burns Isakson Rohrabacher  
 Burr Issa Ros-Lehtinen  
 Burton (IN) Istook Royce  
 Calvert Janklow Ryan (WI)  
 Camp Jenkins Ryun (KS)  
 Cannon Johnson (CT) Schrock  
 Cantor Johnson (IL) Sensenbrenner  
 Capito Jones (NC) Sessions  
 Carter Keller Shadegg  
 Castle Kelly Shaw  
 Chabot Kennedy (MN) Shays  
 Chocola King (IA) Sherwood  
 Coble King (NY) Shimkus  
 Cole Kingston Shuster  
 Collins Kirk Simmons  
 Cox Kline Simpson  
 Crane Knollenberg Smith (MI)  
 Crenshaw Kolbe Smith (NJ)  
 Cubin LaHood Smith (TX)  
 Culberson Latham Souder  
 Cunningham LaTourette Stearns  
 Davis, Jo Ann Leach Sweeney  
 Davis, Tom Lewis (CA) Tancredo  
 Deal (GA) Lewis (KY) Tauzin  
 DeLay Linder Taylor (NC)  
 DeMint LoBiondo Terry  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lucas (OK) Thomas  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Manzullo Thornberry  
 Doolittle McCotter Tiahrt  
 Dreier McCrery Tiberi  
 Duncan McHugh Toomey  
 Dunn McNinis Turner (OH)  
 Ehlers McKeon Upton  
 Emerson Mica Vitter  
 English Miller (FL) Walden (OR)  
 Everett Miller (MI) Walsh  
 Feeney Miller, Gary Wamp  
 Flake Moran (KS) Weldon (FL)  
 Fletcher Murphy Weldon (PA)  
 Foley Musgrave Weller  
 Forbes Myrick Whitfield  
 Fossella Nethercutt Wicker  
 Franks (AZ) Neugebauer Wilson (NM)  
 Frelinghuysen Ney Wilson (SC)  
 Gallegly Northup Wolf  
 Garrett (NJ) Norwood Young (AK)  
 Gerlach Nunes Young (FL)

## NOES—201

Abercrombie Berry Cardin  
 Ackerman Bishop (GA) Cardoza  
 Alexander Bishop (NY) Carson (IN)  
 Allen Blumenauer Carson (OK)  
 Andrews Boswell Case  
 Baca Boucher Clay  
 Baird Boyd Clyburn  
 Baldwin Brady (PA) Conyers  
 Ballance Brown (OH) Cooper  
 Becerra Brown, Corrine Costello  
 Bell Capps Cramer  
 Berman Capuano Crowley

Kind Pomeroy  
 Kleczka Price (NC)  
 Kucinich Rahall  
 Lampson Rangel  
 Davis (IL) Reyes  
 Davis (TN) Rodriguez  
 DeFazio Larsen (WA) Ross  
 DeGette Larson (CT) Rothman  
 Delahunt Lee Roybal-Allard  
 DeLauro Levin Ruppelberger  
 Deutsch Lewis (GA) Rush  
 Doggett Lipinski Ryan (OH)  
 Dooley (CA) Lofgren Sabo  
 Doyle Lowey Sanchez, Linda  
 Edwards Lucas (KY) T.  
 Emanuel Lynch Sanchez, Loretta  
 Engel Majette Sanders  
 Eshoo Maloney Sandlin  
 Etheridge Markey Schakowsky  
 Evans Marshall Schiff  
 Farr Matheson Scott (GA)  
 Fattah Matsui Scott (VA)  
 Filner McCarthy (MO) Serrano  
 Frank (MA) McCarthy (NY) Sherman  
 Frost McCollum Skelton  
 Gonzalez McDermott Slaughter  
 Gordon McGovern Smith (WA)  
 Green (TX) McIntyre Snyder  
 Grijalva McNulty Solis  
 Gutierrez Meehan Spratt  
 Hall Meek (FL) Stark  
 Harman Meeks (NY) Stenholm  
 Hastings (FL) Menendez Strickland  
 Hill Michaud Stupak  
 Hinchey Millender Tanner  
 Hinojosa McDonald Tauscher  
 Hoeffel Miller (NC) Taylor (MS)  
 Holden Miller, George Thompson (CA)  
 Holt Mollohan Thompson (MS)  
 Honda Moore Tierney  
 Hooley (OR) Moran (VA) Towns  
 Hoyer Murtha Turner (TX)  
 Inslee Nadler Udall (CO)  
 Israel Napolitano Udall (NM)  
 Jackson (IL) Neal (MA) Van Hollen  
 Jackson-Lee Oberstar Velazquez  
 (TX) Obey Visclosky  
 Jefferson Oliver Waters  
 John Ortiz Watson  
 Johnson, E. B. Owens Watt  
 Jones (OH) Pallone Waxman  
 Kanjorski Pascrell Weiner  
 Kaptur Pastor Wexler  
 Kennedy (RI) Payne Woolsey  
 Kildee Pelosi Wu  
 Kilpatrick Peterson (MN) Wynn

## NOT VOTING—10

Berkley Ferguson Saxton  
 Bishop (UT) Ford Sullivan  
 Dicks Gephardt  
 Dingell Pearce

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1335

Mr. OSBORNE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 144, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

## AYES—281

Aderholt Gilchrest Neugebauer  
 Alexander Gillmor Ney  
 Bachus Gingrey Northup  
 Baker Goode Norwood  
 Ballenger Goodlatte Nunes  
 Barrett (SC) Goss Nussle  
 Bartlett (MD) Granger Ortiz  
 Barton (TX) Graves Osborne  
 Bass Green (WI) Ose  
 Beauprez Greenwood Otter  
 Bereuter Gutknecht Oxley  
 Berman Hall Paul  
 Biggart Harman Pence  
 Bilirakis Harris Peterson (MN)  
 Blackburn Hart Petri  
 Blumenauer Hastings (FL) Pickering  
 Blunt Hastings (WA) Pitts  
 Boehlert Hayes Platts  
 Boehner Hayworth Pomo  
 Bonilla Hefley Pomeroy  
 Bonner Hensarling Porter  
 Bono Herger Portman  
 Boozman Hill Price (NC)  
 Boswell Hinojosa Pryce (OH)  
 Boyd Hobson Putnam  
 Bradley (NH) Hoekstra Quinn  
 Brady (TX) Hooley (OR) Radanovich  
 Brown (SC) Hostettler Ramstad  
 Brown, Corrine Houghton Rangel  
 Brown-Waite, Hoyer Regula  
 Ginny Hulshof Rehberg  
 Burgess Hunter Renzi  
 Burns Hyde Reyes  
 Burr Isakson Reynolds  
 Burton (IN) Israel Rogers (AL)  
 Buyer Issa Rogers (KY)  
 Calvert Istook Rogers (MI)  
 Camp Janklow Rohrabacher  
 Cannon Jefferson Ros-Lehtinen  
 Cantor Jenkins Royce  
 Capito John Ryan (WI)  
 Cardin Johnson (CT) Ryun (KS)  
 Carson (OK) Johnson (IL) Sandlin  
 Carter Johnson, Sam Saxton  
 Castle Jones (NC) Schrock  
 Chabot Keller Sensenbrenner  
 Chocola Kelly Sessions  
 Coble Kennedy (MN) Shadegg  
 Cole Kind Shaw  
 Collins King (IA) Shays  
 Cox King (NY) Sherwood  
 Cramer Kingston Shimkus  
 Crane Kirk Shuster  
 Crenshaw Kline Simmons  
 Cubin Knollenberg Simpson  
 Culberson Kolbe Skelton  
 Cunningham LaHood Smith (MI)  
 Davis (AL) Larsen (WA) Smith (NJ)  
 Davis (CA) Latham Smith (TX)  
 Davis (FL) LaTourette Smith (WA)  
 Davis (TN) Leach Snyder  
 Davis, Jo Ann Levin Souder  
 Davis, Tom Lewis (CA) Stearns  
 Deal (GA) Lewis (KY) Stenholm  
 DeLay Linder Sweeney  
 DeMint LoBiondo Tancredo  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lofgren Tanner  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Lucas (KY) Tauscher  
 Doggett Lucas (OK) Tauzin  
 Dooley (CA) Majette Taylor (NC)  
 Doolittle Manzullo Terry  
 Dreier Marshall Thomas  
 Duncan Matheson Thornberry  
 Dunn Matsui Tiahrt  
 Edwards McCotter Tiberi  
 Ehlers McCrery Toomey  
 Emanuel McHugh Turner (OH)  
 Emerson McNnis Turner (TX)  
 English McKeon Upton  
 Eshoo Meehan Vitter  
 Etheridge Meek (FL) Walden (OR)  
 Everett Meeks (NY) Walsh  
 Feeney Mica Wamp  
 Flake Miller (FL) Weldon (FL)  
 Fletcher Miller (MI) Weldon (PA)  
 Foley Miller, Gary Weller  
 Forbes Moore Whitfield  
 Fossella Moran (KS) Wicker  
 Franks (AZ) Moran (VA) Wilson (NM)  
 Frelinghuysen Murphy Wilson (SC)  
 Gallegly Musgrave Wolf  
 Garrett (NJ) Myrick Wu  
 Gerlach Neal (MA) Young (AK)  
 Gibbons Nethercutt Young (FL)

## NOES—144

Abercrombie Hinchey Owens  
 Ackerman Hoeffel Pallone  
 Allen Holden Pascarell  
 Andrews Holt Pastor  
 Baca Honda Payne  
 Baird Inslee Pelosi  
 Baldwin Jackson (IL) Rahall  
 Ballance Jackson-Lee Rodriguez  
 Becerra (TX) Ross  
 Bell Johnson, E. B. Rothman  
 Berry Jones (OH) Roybal-Allard  
 Bishop (GA) Kanjorski Ruppersberger  
 Bishop (NY) Kaptur Rush  
 Boucher Kennedy (RI) Ryan (OH)  
 Brady (PA) Kildee Sabo  
 Brown (OH) Kilpatrick Sanchez, Linda  
 Capps Kleczka T.  
 Capuano Kucinich Sanchez, Loretta  
 Cardoza Lampson Sanders  
 Carson (IN) Langevin Schakowsky  
 Case Lantos Schiff  
 Clay Larson (CT) Scott (GA)  
 Clyburn Lee Scott (VA)  
 Conyers Lewis (GA) Serrano  
 Cooper Lipinski Sherman  
 Costello Lowey Slaughter  
 Crowley Lynch Solis  
 Cummings Maloney Spratt  
 Davis (IL) Markley Stark  
 DeFazio McCarthy (MO) Strickland  
 DeGette McCarthy (NY) Stupak  
 Delahunt McCollum Taylor (MS)  
 DeLauro McDermott Thompson (CA)  
 Deutsch McGovern Thompson (MS)  
 Dicks McIntyre Tierney  
 Dingell McNulty Towns  
 Doyle Menendez Udall (CO)  
 Engel Michaud Udall (NM)  
 Evans Millender Van Hollen  
 Farr McDonald Velazquez  
 Fattah Miller (NC) Waters  
 Filner Miller, George Watson  
 Frank (MA) Mollohan Watt  
 Frost Murtha Waxman  
 Gonzalez Nadler Weiner  
 Gordon Napolitano Wexler  
 Green (TX) Oberstar Woolsey  
 Grijalva Obey Wynn  
 Gutierrez Oliver

## NOT VOTING—9

Akin Ferguson Pearce  
 Berkley Ford Peterson (PA)  
 Bishop (UT) Gephardt Sullivan

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded they have 2 minutes in which to cast their vote.

□ 1344

Ms. HARMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MOTION TO RECONSIDER OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to reconsider. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida moves to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

## MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

## AYES—228

Aderholt Gilchrest Osborne  
 Akin Gillmor Ose  
 Bachus Gingrey Otter  
 Baker Goode Oxley  
 Ballenger Goodlatte Paul  
 Barrett (SC) Goss Pence  
 Bartlett (MD) Granger Peterson (PA)  
 Barton (TX) Graves Petri  
 Bass Green (WI) Pickering  
 Beauprez Greenwood Pitts  
 Bereuter Gutknecht Platts  
 Biggart Harris Porter  
 Bilirakis Hart Pomo  
 Blackburn Hastings (WA) Portman  
 Blunt Hayes Pryce (OH)  
 Boehlert Hayworth Putnam  
 Boehner Hefley Quinn  
 Bonilla Hensarling Radanovich  
 Bonner Herger Ramstad  
 Bono Hinojosa Regula  
 Boozman Hobson Rehberg  
 Bradley (NH) Hoekstra Renzi  
 Brady (TX) Hostettler Reynolds  
 Brown (SC) Houghton Rogers (AL)  
 Brown-Waite, Hulshof Rogers (KY)  
 Ginny Hunter Rogers (MI)  
 Burgess Hyde Rohrabacher  
 Burns Isakson Ros-Lehtinen  
 Burr Issa Royce  
 Burton (IN) Janklow Ryan (WI)  
 Buyer Jenkins Ryun (KS)  
 Calvert Johnson (CT) Saxton  
 Camp Johnson (IL) Schrock  
 Cannon Johnson, Sam Sensenbrenner  
 Cantor Jones (NC) Sessions  
 Capito Keller Shadegg  
 Carter Kelly Shaw  
 Castle Kennedy (MN) Shays  
 Chabot Kind Sherwood  
 Chocola King (IA) Shimkus  
 Coble King (NY) Shuster  
 Cole Kingston Simmons  
 Collins Kirk Simpson  
 Cox Kline Smith (MI)  
 Cramer Knollenberg Smith (NJ)  
 Crane Kolbe Smith (TX)  
 Crenshaw LaHood Souder  
 Cubin Latham Stearns  
 Culberson LaTourette Sweeney  
 Cunningham Leach Tancredo  
 Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (CA) Tauzin  
 Davis, Tom Lewis (KY) Terry  
 Deal (GA) Linder Thomas  
 DeLay LoBiondo Thornberry  
 DeMint Lucas (OK) Tiahrt  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Manzullo Tiberi  
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCotter Toomey  
 Doolittle McCrery Turner (OH)  
 Dreier McHugh Turner (TX)  
 Duncan McNnis Upton  
 Dunn McKeon Vitter  
 Ehlers Mica Walden (OR)  
 Emerson Miller (FL) Walsh  
 English Miller (MI) Wamp  
 Everett Miller, Gary Weldon (FL)  
 Feeney Moran (KS) Weldon (PA)  
 Flake Murphy Weller  
 Fletcher Musgrave Whitfield  
 Foley Myrick Wicker  
 Forbes Nethercutt Wilson (NM)  
 Fossella Neugebauer Wilson (SC)  
 Franks (AZ) Ney Wolf  
 Frelinghuysen Northup Young (AK)  
 Gallegly Norwood Young (FL)  
 Garrett (NJ) Nunes  
 Gerlach Nussle  
 Gibbons Ortiz

## NOES—197

Abercrombie Baca Bell  
 Ackerman Baird Berman  
 Alexander Baldwin Berry  
 Allen Ballance Bishop (GA)  
 Andrews Becerra Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer Inslee  
 Boswell Israel  
 Boucher Jackson (IL)  
 Boyd Jackson-Lee  
 Brady (PA) (TX)  
 Brown (OH) Jefferson  
 Brown, Corrine John  
 Capps Johnson, E. B.  
 Capuano Jones (OH)  
 Cardin Kanjorski  
 Cardoza Kaptur  
 Carson (IN) Kennedy (RI)  
 Carson (OK) Kildee  
 Case Kilpatrick  
 Clay Kleczka  
 Clyburn Kucinich  
 Cooper Lampson  
 Costello Langevin  
 Crowley Lantos  
 Cummings Larsen (WA)  
 Davis (AL) Larson (CT)  
 Davis (CA) Lee  
 Davis (FL) Levin  
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA)  
 Davis (TN) Lipinski  
 DeFazio Lofgren  
 DeGette Lowey  
 Delahunt Lucas (KY)  
 DeLauro Lynch  
 Deutsch Majette  
 Dicks Maloney  
 Dingell Markey  
 Doggett Marshall  
 Dooley (CA) Matheson  
 Doyle Matsui  
 Edwards McCarthy (MO)  
 Emanuel McCarthy (NY)  
 Engel McCollum  
 Eshoo McDermott  
 Etheridge McGovern  
 Evans McIntyre  
 Farr McNulty  
 Fattah Meehan  
 Filner Meek (FL)  
 Frank (MA) Meeks (NY)  
 Frost Menendez  
 Gonzalez Michaud  
 Gordon Millender-  
 Green (TX) McDonald  
 Grijalva Miller (NC)  
 Gutierrez Miller, George  
 Hall Mollohan  
 Harman Moore  
 Hastings (FL) Moran (VA)  
 Hill Murtha  
 Hinchey Nadler  
 Hoeffel Napolitano  
 Holden Neal (MA)  
 Holt Oberstar  
 Honda Obey  
 Hooley (OR) Olver  
 Hoyer Owens

## NOT VOTING—9

Berkley Ferguson Istook  
 Bishop (UT) Ford Pearce  
 Conyers Gephardt Sullivan

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1353

Mr. REYES changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 29, noes 394, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

## AYES—29

Baird Grijalva Sanchez, Loretta  
 Bishop (GA) Hastings (FL) Sandlin  
 Brown, Corrine Jones (OH) Schakowsky  
 Capuano Kaptur Shimkus  
 Clay Kennedy (RI) Solis  
 Clyburn McIntyre Thompson (MS)  
 Conyers Miller, George Towns  
 Evans Olver Watson  
 Filner Pallone Woolsey  
 Frank (MA) Rangel

## NOES—394

Abercrombie Davis (AL) Hobson  
 Ackerman Davis (CA) Hoeffel  
 Aderholt Davis (FL) Hoekstra  
 Akin Davis (IL) Holden  
 Alexander Davis (TN) Holt  
 Allen Davis, Jo Ann Honda  
 Andrews Davis, Tom Hooley (OR)  
 Baca Hostettler  
 Bachus Houghton  
 Baker Delahunt Hoyer  
 Baldwin Hulshof  
 Ballance Hunter  
 Ballenger DeMint Hyde  
 Barrett (SC) Deutsch Inslee  
 Bartlett (MD) Diaz-Balart, L. Isakson  
 Barton (TX) Diaz-Balart, M. Israel  
 Bass Dicks Issa  
 Beauprez Dingell Istook  
 Becerra Doggett Jackson (IL)  
 Bell Dooley (CA) Jackson-Lee  
 Bereuter Doolittle (TX)  
 Berman Doyle Janklow  
 Berry Dreier Jefferson  
 Biggert Duncan Jenkins  
 Bilirakis Dunn John  
 Bishop (NY) Edwards Johnson (CT)  
 Blackburn Ehlers Johnson (IL)  
 Blumenauer Emanuel Johnson, E. B.  
 Blunt Emerson Johnson, Sam  
 Boehlert Engel Jones (NC)  
 Bonilla English Kanjorski  
 Bonner Eshoo Keller  
 Bono Etheridge Kelly  
 Boozman Everett Kennedy (MN)  
 Boswell Farr Kildee  
 Boucher Fattah Kilpatrick  
 Boyd Feeney Kind  
 Bradley (NH) Flake King (IA)  
 Brady (PA) Fletcher King (NY)  
 Brady (TX) Foley Kingston  
 Brown (OH) Forbes Kirk  
 Brown (SC) Fossella Kleczka  
 Brown-Waite, Franks (AZ) Kline  
 Ginny Frelinghuysen Knollenberg  
 Burgess Frost Kolbe  
 Burns Gallegly Kucinich  
 Burr Garrett (NJ) LaHood  
 Burton (IN) Gerlach Lampson  
 Buyer Gibbons Langevin  
 Calvert Gilchrist Lantos  
 Camp Gillmor Larsen (WA)  
 Cannon Gingrey Larson (CT)  
 Capito Gonzalez Latham  
 Capps Goode LaTourette  
 Cardin Goodlatte Leach  
 Cardoza Gordon Lee  
 Carson (IN) Goss Levin  
 Carson (OK) Granger Lewis (CA)  
 Carter Graves Lewis (GA)  
 Case Green (TX) Linder  
 Castle Green (WI) Lipinski  
 Chabot Greenwood LoBiondo  
 Chocola Gutierrez Lofgren  
 Coble Gutknecht Lowey  
 Cole Hall Lucas (KY)  
 Collins Harman Lucas (OK)  
 Cooper Harris Lynch  
 Costello Hart Majette  
 Cox Hastings (WA) Maloney  
 Cramer Hayes Manzullo  
 Crane Hayworth Markey  
 Crenshaw Hefley Marshall  
 Crowley Hensarling Matheson  
 Cubin Herger Matsui  
 Culberson Hill McCarthy (MO)  
 Cummings Hinchey McCarthy (NY)  
 Cunningham Hinojosa McCollum

McCotter Pitts Smith (NJ)  
 McCrery Platts Smith (TX)  
 McDermott Pombo Smith (WA)  
 McGovern Pomeroy Snyder  
 McHugh Porter Souder  
 McInnis Portman Spratt  
 McKeon Price (NC) Stark  
 McNulty Pryce (OH) Stearns  
 Meehan Putnam Stenholm  
 Meek (FL) Quinn Strickland  
 Meeks (NY) Radanovich Stupak  
 Menendez Rahall Sweeney  
 Mica Ramstad Tancredo  
 Michaud Regula Tanner  
 Millender Rehberg Tauscher  
 McDonald Renzi Tauzin  
 Miller (FL) Reyes Taylor (MS)  
 Miller (MI) Reynolds Taylor (NC)  
 Miller (NC) Rodriguez Terry  
 Miller, Gary Rogers (AL) Thomas  
 Mollohan Rogers (KY) Thompson (CA)  
 Moore Rogers (MI) Thornberry  
 Moran (KS) Rohrabacher Tiahrt  
 Moran (VA) Ros-Lehtinen Tiberi  
 Murphy Ross Tierney  
 Murtha Rothman Toomey  
 Musgrave Roybal-Allard Turner (OH)  
 Myrick Royce Turner (TX)  
 Nadler Rumpersberger Udall (CO)  
 Napolitano Rush Udall (NM)  
 Neal (MA) Ryan (OH) Upton  
 Nethercutt Ryan (WI) Van Hollen  
 Neugebauer Ryun (KS) Velazquez  
 Ney Sabo Visclosky  
 Northup Sanchez, Linda  
 Norwood T. Walden (OR)  
 Nunes Sanders Walsh  
 Nussle Saxton Wamp  
 Oberstar Schiff Waters  
 Obey Schrock Watt  
 Ortiz Scott (GA) Waxman  
 Osborne Scott (VA) Weiner  
 Ose Sensenbrenner Weldon (FL)  
 Otter Serrano Weldon (PA)  
 Owens Sessions Weller  
 Oxley Shadegg Wexler  
 Pascrell Shaw Whitfield  
 Pastor Shays Wicker  
 Paul Sherman Wilson (NM)  
 Payne Sherwood Wilson (SC)  
 Pelosi Shuster Wolf  
 Pence Simmons Wu  
 Peterson (MN) Simpson Wynn  
 Peterson (PA) Skelton Young (AK)  
 Petri Slaughter Young (FL)  
 Pickering Smith (MI)

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

DeFazio

## NOT VOTING—10

Berkley Ferguson Pearce  
 Bishop (UT) Ford Sullivan  
 Boehner Gephardt  
 Cantor Lewis (KY)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) (during the vote). Members are advised that they have 2 minutes to cast their vote.

□ 1410

Mr. HOEKSTRA changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the press accounts that have been submitted, and it qualifies as a question of personal privilege under rule IX.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have always considered the time spent in this institution, the people's House, as one of the highest honors a person can be provided by this country. Each of us is elected by the people to be a Member. Each of us has an equal right to be here. But what we do here, what position or responsibilities that we have, we owe to each other.

Last Friday in the Ways and Means Committee while conducting a markup of a bill as a result of decisions made by members of the committee and by me as chairman, there was a breakdown of order and decorum. To reestablish order in the committee, I requested that staff place a call to the Sergeant at Arms. That decision, in my opinion, was proper and appropriate. A second decision to instruct staff to see if the Democrats that had occupied the library would go to room 1129, which is a room reserved for the Democrats for meetings and caucuses, and to enlist the support of the Capitol Police to do so if necessary, that decision, in the words of Norm Ornstein in a column today in *Roll Call*, was described as "just plain stupid." I agree with him.

Every Member has as much right to be here and to be heard as any other. In hindsight, calling the Sergeant at Arms for help in the committee room, I still believe, was good judgment. My instruction to use the Capitol Police, if necessary, in the library was not. I learned a very painful lesson on Friday. As Members, you deserve better judgment from me, and you will get it. Because of my poor judgment, those outside the House who want to trivialize, marginalize, and debase this institution were given an opportunity to do so. Because of my poor judgment, the stewardship of my party as the majority party in this House has been unfairly criticized.

□ 1415

Because of my poor judgment, I became the focus of examination rather than the issues. The visions that each of us have for a better America, different as though they may be but equally entitled to be heard, were not focused on.

It has been said that our strengths are our weaknesses. Or as my mother would have put it, "When they were passing out moderation, you were hiding behind the door." I believe my intensity has served useful purposes, fixing problems and passing laws that otherwise may not have made it. But when one is charged and entrusted with responsibilities by you, my colleagues, as I have been, you deserve better. Moderation is required.

For the remainder of my time in this, the people's House, I want to rededicate my efforts to strengthening this institution as the embodiment of what is best about us. I need your help and I invite it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond in a positive way, and I make a parliamentary inquiry. Would this be the proper time to ask whether my privilege of the House motion could be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will continue to take that timing under advisement.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

#### RESPONSE TO QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I first want to thank the chairman of my committee for what had to be a very difficult task for him in coming before this august body and expressing regret for poor judgment. All of us at some time or the other have had poor judgment, and it is always difficult for us, especially as politicians, to say publicly that we made a mistake.

The reason I asked to respond is because I know that each and every one of us love this body and recognize that we are privileged, if not blessed, to have the opportunity to represent the people of the United States of America. But whether or not it is a Thomas-Rangel dispute, a Republican-Democrat dispute, the only question that we have is that we leave this place in no worse shape than we inherited it. Each Congress tries to improve the quality of civility, the partnership, the working together, the mutual respect and saying, as my chairman said, that we all want a better America, indeed a better world.

But we have diversity in this country. It is our biggest strength, and to respect the American people, we have to respect each other. It is not a question of personality. We cannot afford to be personal about it. There has to be respect. Yes, the majority has the responsibility to lead and to get their legislation through, but the minority has the right to be respected, to be heard, and to know, in a timely fashion when that legislation is coming up, to know what is in the bill, to have time and to be able to use not the rules that we make up as we go along but the rules of civility that allowed this body to exist for over 200 years. These were not Republican rules. They were not Democratic rules. They were rules to say, notwithstanding your emotion, this will guide you for a better Congress and a better America.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that out of this, because our parents have always told us that out of the worst day of the worst situation, if you commit to it, you can find some good to come out of it. So do not look at it as being a Thomas-Rangel, Committee on Ways and Means issue. Let us look at this as being a House of Representatives issue. Let us see whether every committee and every Member can say that in this

House we have got to respect each other no matter how much we differ. We should try to believe that the best of us is to do the best job for our country.

Chairman THOMAS, I thank you for coming forward and giving us the opportunity to say can we not take this House to a higher level? Can we not go back home and make the people proud of us? And whether we win or lose in terms of legislation, whether we respect each other is what I think those that we leave this Congress to would respect us for. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 326 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2799.

□ 1422

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2799) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) had been disposed of by a point of order.

#### SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OSE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OSE:

At the end of the bill after the last section (preceding the short title) insert the following new title:

# **TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in violation of section 212(a)(10)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—424

Abercrombie	Cole	Gordon
Ackerman	Collins	Goss
Aderholt	Conyers	Granger
Akin	Cooper	Graves
Alexander	Costello	Green (TX)
Allen	Cox	Green (WI)
Andrews	Cramer	Greenwood
Baca	Crane	Grijalva
Bachus	Crenshaw	Gutierrez
Baird	Crowley	Gutknecht
Baker	Cubin	Hall
Baldwin	Culberson	Harman
Ballance	Cummings	Harris
Ballenger	Cunningham	Hart
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Barton (TX)	Davis (FL)	Hayes
Bass	Davis (IL)	Hayworth
Beauprez	Davis, Jo Ann	Hefley
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Hensarling
Bell	Deal (GA)	Herger
Bereuter	DeFazio	Hill
Berman	DeGette	Hinchey
Berry	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Biggart	DeLauro	Hobson
Bilirakis	DeLay	Hoeffel
Bishop (GA)	DeMint	Hoekstra
Bishop (NY)	Deutsch	Holden
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holt
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, M.	Honda
Blunt	Dicks	Hooley (OR)
Boehlert	Dingell	Hostettler
Boehner	Doggett	Houghton
Bonilla	Dooley (CA)	Hoyer
Bonner	Doolittle	Hulshof
Bono	Doyle	Hunter
Boozman	Dreier	Hyde
Boswell	Duncan	Inslee
Boucher	Dunn	Isakson
Boyd	Edwards	Israel
Bradley (NH)	Ehlers	Issa
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Istook
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Brown (SC)	English	(TX)
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Janklow
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Jefferson
Ginny	Evans	Jenkins
Burgess	Everett	John
Burns	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Burr	Fattah	Johnson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Feeney	Johnson, E. B.
Buyer	Filner	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Flake	Jones (NC)
Camp	Fletcher	Jones (OH)
Cannon	Foley	Kanjorski
Cantor	Forbes	Kaptur
Capito	Fossella	Keller
Capps	Frank (MA)	Kelly
Capuano	Franks (AZ)	Kennedy (MN)
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (RI)
Cardoza	Frost	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Gallegly	Kilpatrick
Carson (OK)	Garrett (NJ)	Kind
Carter	Gerlach	King (IA)
Case	Gibbons	King (NY)
Castle	Gilchrest	Kingston
Chabot	Gillmor	Kirk
Chocola	Gingrey	Klecza
Clay	Gonzalez	Kline
Clyburn	Goode	Knollenberg
Coble	Goodlatte	Kolbe

Kucinich	Nussle	Shaw
LaHood	Oberstar	Shays
Lampson	Obeys	Sherman
Langevin	Olver	Sherwood
Lantos	Ortiz	Shimkus
Larsen (WA)	Osborne	Shuster
Larson (CT)	Ose	Simmons
Latham	Otter	Simpson
LaTourette	Owens	Skelton
Leach	Oxley	Slaughter
Lee	Pallone	Smith (MI)
Levin	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Paul	Snyder
Lewis (KY)	Payne	Solis
Linder	Pelosi	Souder
Lipinski	Pence	Spratt
LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Stark
Lofgren	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Lowey	Petri	Stenholm
Lucas (KY)	Pickering	Strickland
Lucas (OK)	Pitts	Stupak
Lynch	Platts	Sweeney
Majette	Pombo	Tancredo
Maloney	Pomeroy	Tanner
Manzullo	Porter	Tauscher
Markey	Portman	Tauzin
Marshall	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Matsui	Putnam	Terry
McCarthy (MO)	Quinn	Thomas
McCarthy (NY)	Radanovich	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McCotter	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCrery	Rangel	Tiahrt
McDermott	Regula	Tiberi
McHugh	Rehberg	Tierney
McInnis	Renzi	Toomey
McIntyre	Reyes	Towns
McKeon	Reynolds	Turner (OH)
McNulty	Rodriguez	Turner (TX)
Meenan	Rogers (AL)	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Udall (NM)
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Menendez	Rohrabacher	Van Hollen
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Velazquez
Michaud	Ross	Visclosky
Millender-	Rothman	Vitter
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Walden (OR)
Miller (FL)	Royce	Walsh
Miller (MI)	Ruppersberger	Wamp
Miller (NC)	Rush	Waters
Miller, Gary	Ryan (OH)	Watson
Miller, George	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Mollohan	Ryun (KS)	Waxman
Moore	Sabo	Weiner
Moran (KS)	Sanchez, Linda	Weldon (FL)
Moran (VA)	T.	Weldon (PA)
Murphy	Sanchez, Loretta	Weller
Murtha	Sanders	Wexler
Musgrave	Sandlin	Whitfield
Myrick	Saxton	Wicker
Nadler	Schakowsky	Wilson (NM)
Napolitano	Schiff	Wilson (SC)
Neal (MA)	Schrock	Wolf
Nethercutt	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Neugebauer	Scott (VA)	Wu
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Northup	Serrano	Young (AK)
Norwood	Sessions	Young (FL)
Nunes	Shadegg	

NOT VOTING—10

Berkley	Ford	Smith (NJ)
Bishop (UT)	Gephardt	Sullivan
Davis (TN)	McGovern	
Ferguson	Pearce	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1441

Mr. FILNER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 418, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the remainder of this

series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTTLER

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTTLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSTETTTLER:

Insert in an appropriate place the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to enforce the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in *Glassroth v. Moore*, decided July 1, 2003 or *Glassroth v. Moore*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1067 (M. D. Ala. 2002).

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 161, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—260

Aderholt	Cubin	Hooley (OR)
Akin	Culberson	Hostettler
Alexander	Cunningham	Houghton
Bachus	Davis (TN)	Hulshof
Baker	Davis, Jo Ann	Hunter
Ballenger	Deal (GA)	Hyde
Barrett (SC)	DeLay	Isakson
Bartlett (MD)	DeMint	Issa
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Istook
Bass	Diaz-Balart, M.	Janklow
Beauprez	Doolittle	Jenkins
Bereuter	Doyle	John
Berry	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Biggart	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Blackburn	English	Kaptur
Blunt	Etheridge	Keller
Boehlert	Everett	Kelly
Boehner	Feeney	Kennedy (MN)
Bonilla	Flake	King (IA)
Bonner	Fletcher	King (NY)
Bono	Foley	Kingston
Boozman	Forbes	Kirk
Boswell	Fossella	Kline
Boyd	Franks (AZ)	Knollenberg
Bradley (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Brady (TX)	Gallegly	LaHood
Brown (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Langevin
Brown-Waite,	Gibbons	Latham
Ginny	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Burgess	Gillmor	Leach
Burns	Gingrey	Lewis (KY)
Burr	Goode	Lipinski
Burton (IN)	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Buyer	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Calvert	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Camp	Granger	Lynch
Cannon	Graves	Manzullo
Cantor	Green (TX)	Marshall
Capito	Green (WI)	Matheson
Cardoza	Gutknecht	McCotter
Carson (IN)	Hall	McCrery
Carson (OK)	Harris	McHugh
Carter	Hart	McInnis
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Chocola	Hayes	McKeon
Coble	Hayworth	Mica
Cole	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Collins	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Costello	Herger	Miller, Gary
Cox	Hill	Mollohan
Cramer	Hobson	Moore
Crane	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Crenshaw	Holden	

Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Northwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Owens  
Paul  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula

Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sandlin  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Scott (GA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadeegg  
Shaw  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns

Stenholm  
Stupak  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOES—161

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Becerra  
Bell  
Berman  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boucher  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Case  
Castle  
Clay  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Tom  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Gerlach  
Gonzalez  
Greenwood

Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Klay  
Klecza  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Majette  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moran (VA)  
Nadler

Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Olver  
Otter  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Shays  
Sherman  
Simpson  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Strickland  
Tauscher  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu

## NOT VOTING—13

Berkley  
Bishop (UT)  
Clyburn  
Ferguson  
Ford

Gephardt  
Meek (FL)  
Obey  
Pearce  
Pelosi

Radanovich  
Sullivan  
Tierney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN  
The CHAIRMAN (during the vote.)  
Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1449

Mr. OTTER and Mr. OXLEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 Offered by Mr. HINCHEY:  
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

## TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used to prevent the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Nevada, Oregon, or Washington from implementing State laws authorizing the use of medical marijuana in those States.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 273, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

## AYES—152

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Blumauer  
Bono  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Case  
Clay  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doyle  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr

Fattah  
Filner  
Flake  
Frank (MA)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gilchrist  
Gonzalez  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hinchey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klecza  
Kucinich  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren  
Lowey

Majette  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Otter  
Owens  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rodriguez  
Rohrabacher  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush

Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Simpson

Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Solis  
Stark  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tancredo  
Tauscher  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns

## NOES—273

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Bell  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Boozman  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (OK)  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dingell  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
English  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett

Feeney  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Janklow  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Manzullo  
Marshall  
Matheson  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHugh

McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Menendez  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sandlin  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadeegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Sweeney  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thornberry

Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Vitter

Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker

Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Wu  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—9

Berkley  
Bishop (UT)  
Ferguson

Ford  
Gephardt  
Miller, George

Neugebauer  
Pearce  
Sullivan

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1456

Mr. THOMAS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUSH:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

## TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the sentencing phase of any Federal prosecution in which the penalty of death is sought by the United States.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 85, noes 339, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—85

Abercrombie  
Allen  
Baldwin  
Bartlett (MD)  
Berman  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Clay  
Conyers  
Cummings  
Davis (IL)  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
Doyle  
Ehlers  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hastings (FL)

Hinchey  
Holt  
Jackson (IL)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kleczka  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewy (GA)  
Lowe  
Majette  
Maloney  
Markey  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNulty  
Meeks (NY)  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Nadler

Napolitano  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Owens  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ruybal-Aillard  
Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda T.  
Sanders  
Schakowsky  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Smith (NJ)  
Solis  
Stark  
Tierney  
Towns  
Van Hollen

Velazquez  
Waters

Watson  
Watt

## NOES—339

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alkin  
Alexander  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Ballance  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bell  
Bereuter  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (OK)  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cunningham  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards

Emanuel  
Emerson  
English  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Feeney  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Janklow  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)

Waxman  
Woolsey

Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sweeney

Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton

Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—10

Berkley  
Bishop (UT)  
Calvert  
Ferguson

Ford  
Gephardt  
Gingrey  
King (IA)

Rogers (MI)  
Sullivan

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1504

Mr. OBEY and Mr. ENGEL changed their votes from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the Clerk will read the last lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004”.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2799, the bill providing appropriations for the Department of Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I represent a district that lies along the U.S.-Mexico border. For many years, the region along the 2,000 mile stretch of our southern border was ignored. The bill before us today, will make tremendous strides to recognize the need for increased resources along the southwest border.

This bill includes 168 additional positions for the United States Marshals Service for areas of high priority need and specifically recognizes that the southwest border is such an area.

My district of El Paso lies within the Western District of Texas. This judicial district has been one of the greatest increases of criminal caseloads over the last decade. The majority of these cases are being heard in the El Paso Division of the Western District. The number of federal criminal cases filed in El Paso County has increased from 443 to 2,192 cases since 1994. Last year, the El Paso Division received its second federal judge. Pending Senate confirmation this year, the El Paso Division will have a total of four federal judges.

Mr. Chairman, needless to say, our case backlog is being addressed and more of our cases will be heard. This increase of work for our judges, in turn, means more work for our Marshals Service. Currently, our Marshals are reporting inoperable work load levels in the southwest border districts. As you know, our Marshals are responsible for providing protection for the federal judiciary, transporting federal prisoners, protecting endangered federal

witnesses and managing assets seized from criminal enterprises. This bill would provide much needed relief for our United States Marshals Service along the southwest border communities.

This bill also provides an increase of appropriations for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) from \$250 million to \$400 million. SCAAP is vital to communities all across the country. This program has been dodging the President's ax for the last couple of years. The President has proposed to eliminate this program in his last two budget proposals. Mr. Chairman there is at least one jurisdiction in every state and territory that receives SCAAP funding. Last year, SCAAP appropriations were cut by over 50 percent. Although not nearly enough to fully reimburse our states and localities, the increase for this program is a step in the right direction.

El Paso County relies on SCAAP funds to assist in detaining federal criminals. Without these funds, El Paso County would be forced to tap into other over-stretched resources. These resources are generated by local revenues and are being used to provide for this otherwise federal responsibility. I support this provision in the bill before us, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to see that SCAAP is adequately funded in the future.

I would like to thank my friends and colleagues, the Chairman, Mr. WOLF, and the Ranking Member, Mr. SERRANO, for their work on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, while overall funding has increased from fiscal year 2003, I hope that we can address some key issues before this bill comes back from conference for approval. One program that was particularly hard hit this year is the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP). The funding level this year is \$32.5 million—less than half of last year's appropriation of \$73.3 million. As the founding Chair of the Congressional Public Broadcasting Caucus, I have seen first hand how vital the PTFP program is to communities across the country. Every public television station in America has been issued a mandate to be on the air with a digital signal. The enormous costs of the conversion from analog transmission to digital transmission, estimated at \$1.7 billion, are simply too much for the system to bear alone. If we are to ensure that our local communities continue to receive the rich educational, cultural and informational programs and services offered by local public television stations, we must provide them some financial assistance. Local stations are working with state and private funders, and a federal commitment of matching funds would greatly enhance their success. In fact, much of the state funding is contingent upon a federal match, and many state budget constraints limit public broadcasting funding to well below the need.

The language in the bill regarding the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATF) licensing of firearms dealers is clearly destructive. This bill specifies that BATF could request transaction records from gun retailers only if the request was part of a criminal investigation to determine the disposition of a firearm that is the subject of the investigation, or to identify an individual offender who is the subject or target of the investigation. The measure prohibits the use of funds in the bill to implement or promulgate any rule

requiring a physical inventory of any firearms business licensed under federal law, or to deny licenses to dealers because of low sales volume. This language was added in subcommittee with the adoption of an amendment backed by the National Rifle Association (NRA). The NRA has opposed any meaningful additions to gun safety legislation because they believe we aren't enforcing the laws that already exist. Now they are making it impossible to enforce these laws by cutting back on the scope of the funding, placing restrictions on what can be done, and taking the already weak and porous gun safety legislation and rendering it almost meaningless. Every individual has the right to freedom from the threat of gun violence. Yet, gun violence continues to be an epidemic of enormous proportions year after year. In 2000, there were 28,663 gun deaths in the United States, 10,801 of which were homicides. These numbers are drastically larger than those of any other developed nation. Clearly we are not doing enough to protect our citizens from gun violence.

This bill seriously weakens the reporting and licensing laws for gun dealers. Under current law it is already too easy for a convicted felon to purchase a weapon with the aid of a companion. Registration and licensing requirements are strong tools to keep our cities safe. In Massachusetts, a state which requires both registration and licensing, 69 percent of guns used to commit crimes were purchased out of state. In states which have neither licensing nor registration requirements, 89 percent of guns used in crimes are purchased in-state. Gun registration and licensing is a patchwork, state by state system of gun-control which allows criminals access to legitimately purchased guns. This bill will weaken already insufficient gun safety laws, putting the citizens of our nation in harm's way.

While I am concerned with the funding level of the PTFP and the language included regarding BATF licensing of firearms dealers, I vote in support of this bill to move the appropriations process forward. I call on the conference committee to work to address these shortfalls before reporting the bill back for final approval.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the violation imposed on women prisoners' right to reproductive choice. Abortion has been legal in this country for more than thirty years. *Roe v. Wade* did not lay out specifics that only white women or black women could get an abortion, that only the rich or the poor could have this health care service or that is to be taken away if a woman is imprisoned.

In 1993, Congress lifted the six year funding restriction that had prohibited the use of federal funds to provide abortion services to women in federal prison. After the restrictions were lifted, the Bureau of Prisons required medical, religious or social counseling sessions for women seeking these services. The Bureau even took the steps to respect others views by not requiring the participation of any staff personnel that personally did not agree with reproductive choice. Yet in 1995, the funding restriction was put back in place and once again, women prisoners were denied their reproductive choice.

All the cards are stacked against women in prison. In the last decade, the number of women in federal prison has increased by 182 percent, compared to 152 percent for men,

making women 7.5 percent of the prison population. The rates of infection for HIV and AIDS in women exceed the rate of infection for men in prison with the number of infected women increasing by more than 88 percent since 1991. Amnesty International USA released a report in 1999 revealing that gynecological services, in general, for women in prisons were inadequate and of poor quality. Many women prisoners are victims of physical or sexual abuse and vulnerable to sexual abuse or misconduct by correctional officers.

Now imagine a women in prison being in those conditions, with those circumstances being isolated from family and friends, not earning meaningful compensation from prison jobs, and being pregnant knowing she will receive poor prenatal care, the loss of custody upon the birth, and without the ability to make a decision on her reproductive rights. These women are completely dependent on the health care services provided by the Bureau of Prisons. This ban prevents them from seeking needed reproductive health care and prohibits them from having a reproductive choice.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I oppose this bill. However, I cannot support a bill that makes such deep cuts in investments important to our nation.

Mr. Chairman, among the many egregious cuts in this bill, this Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill for 2004 decreases funding for two critical agencies—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST.

The bill appropriates 6 percent less, or \$181 million, than the current fiscal year for NOAA programs, and is even 8 percent less than the President's request for 2004.

The bill also funds several distinct programs within NOAA, which will also suffer serious cuts. The National Weather Service, while receiving a small 3 percent increase over the current fiscal year, will actually receive \$24 million below the President's request. The National Ocean Service will receive 16 percent less than the current fiscal year. The National Marine Fisheries Service will suffer a 19 percent cut. Funding for programs in Oceanic & Atmospheric Research will decrease by 18 percent. Finally, funding for the National Environmental Satellite Service will decrease by \$3 million.

Mr. Chairman, these are programs that serve the public good in a variety of important ways. They help advance America's commerce, promote environmental protection, preserve our fisheries and other natural resources, and protect lives by monitoring the weather. We are doing a great disservice to the American people by slashing these programs.

Cuts to the National Institute of Standards & Technology, NIST, are just as troubling. This appropriations bill provides a staggering 35 percent less than the current fiscal year. This is a terrible blow to scientific research—the key to our future if we are to compete in the global marketplace.

For example, this bill provides no funds for the Advanced Technology Program started by the Clinton administration to assist the development and utilization of new technologies by the private sector. This could result in a reduction-in-force of as many as 250 NIST personnel from a program that works well.

In fact, the net impact of this bill could be a reduction-in-force of up to 300 people, roughly 10 percent of the NIST staff. Cost-of-living adjustments are not fully funded in this bill, forcing other programs within NIST to absorb \$6.8 million in costs. This could well result in the loss of 50 NIST personnel through attrition or reductions-in-force.

For my constituents, these are devastating cuts. But these cuts are just as significant to the American people outside my area because these cuts in scientific research will curtail NIST's ability to address America's national priorities.

This bill does not fully fund the majority of NIST's proposed initiatives. In some cases, funding is completely wiped. Delays or underinvestment in measurement science now will have significant future impact—delaying the commercialization of emerging technologies. The House Committee's allowance for NIST's efforts related to development of the standards, technology, and practices needed for the cost-effective safety and security of buildings and technical support of fire fighting communities, including emergency response, is less than half of what is required. As a result, the standards and measurements support for upgrading the capabilities of the Nation's fire fighters and the emergency response communities will be significantly delayed. In addition, the shortfall in nanotechnology funding will delay NIST's critical contributions to the National Nanotechnology Initiative.

This bill also does not provide the full funding requested to equip and maintain the new Advanced Measurement Laboratory (AML). Lack of funding for the proper maintenance and operation of the building and the equipment necessary to realize the capabilities of the AML will severely hamper NIST's ability to provide industry and science with the ever more accurate and demanding measurements and standards needed to support advances in nanotechnology, biotechnology, information technology, advanced materials, new manufacturing technology, and other key growth areas. To construct this world-class facility, and then to short-change its maintenance, operation, and equipment needs is inconsistent with the \$235 million investment made in the construction of the AML.

Mr. Chairman, some of these programs may seem mundane to many of us in this chamber. But these are crucial scientific programs that will have long-range benefits for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we need to ask: are we really helping the American people by slashing these programs? The answer, clearly, is no. These cuts are the price we must pay for an ill-conceived budget and tax policy.

Mr. Chairman, I hope to be able to support this bill when it emerges from Conference. I am grateful to the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, Mr. SERRANO, for agreeing to work with me to address the concerns I have expressed.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the serious effects this bill will have on my district and on the nation are explained in news stories from several Colorado newspapers, which I am including for the interest of my colleagues.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, July 23, 2003]

COLORADO SCIENCE JOBS ON THE LINE  
(By M.E. Sprengelmeyer)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is considering deep cuts in federal research funds that would

cause an estimated 190 Colorado scientists to lose their jobs.

About \$14 million in cuts to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration projects in Colorado, and additional cuts to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, were contained in an appropriations bill being considered by the House of Representatives late Tuesday.

If approved as expected, they still must be considered by the U.S. Senate.

"Obviously, it has me gravely concerned," said Susan Avery, director of the University of Colorado Cooperative Institute for Research in the Environmental Sciences. "These are cuts that could be very detrimental to our research programs."

The cuts are contained in a \$38.6 billion appropriations package for the Commerce, Justice and State departments and the federal judiciary.

The bill would cut \$3 million from the Space Environment Center in Boulder and \$6.7 million from climate and global change programs. Meanwhile, the bill would eliminate a \$4.5 million line item meant to cover rent on NOAA facilities in Boulder, meaning those expenses would have to come out of other programs, such as research funds.

NIST would lose about 300 jobs nationwide, including about 60 in Boulder, said Representative Mark Udall, a Boulder Democrat, who tried unsuccessfully to reserve the cuts on the House floor.

"It is one thing to make government leaner. It is another thing to cut jobs year in and year out at facilities all over the country," Udall said in a release.

Avery said the cuts would affect research at both the University of Colorado and Colorado State University, including climate modeling programs and research into weather phenomenon such as El Niño and La Niña.

"Unless the bill is greatly improved in a House-Senate conference committee, it will continue a pattern of bleeding these agencies dry," Udall said.

If approved by the House, the bill would move to the Senate, where state researchers hope the cuts will be reversed by Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, an Ignacio Republican and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

"Senator Campbell has a lot in his hands right now because he could do it," Avery said. "He could make it happen. A lot rides on him."

Camden Hubbard, a spokeswoman for Campbell, said his office is researching the issue.

"He needs to look into it and see exactly what is being cut and make a decision accordingly," Hubbard said. "I have to tell you, money is really tight this year . . . he will see what he can do."

[From the Boulder Daily Camera, July 23, 2003]

SCIENCE COMMUNITY FACES CUTS  
(By Kate Larsen)

The U.S. House of Representatives approved federal budget cuts Tuesday that could cost Boulder's science community \$14 million and nearly 200 jobs, U.S. Rep. Mark Udall's staff said.

The 2004 House Commerce, Justice and State spending bill includes large cuts—for the second consecutive year—to Boulder's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and many labs connected to it. The bill reflects a radical difference in the suggested appropriation from President Bush.

If the Senate passes a similar bill, and the cuts clear a joint conference committee and are approved by the president, local research on climate, air quality and space environmental hazards would be affected.

"It is one thing to make government leaner; it is another thing to cut jobs year in and year out at facilities all over the country," Udall, D-Colo., said in a statement.

Camden Hubbard, spokeswoman U.S. Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, R-Colo., warned that is still early in the process. The Senate has yet to take on this issue.

"Money is very tight and (Sen. Campbell's) going to be looking into this situation to see if these cuts are a good idea or a bad idea," Hubbard said.

The proposed cuts would come on top of \$7 million in cuts NOAA and other labs endured this year.

"Very important weather and climate research would have to be terminated," said Alexander MacDonald, director of NOAA's forecast systems laboratory.

NOAA's Space Environment Center is facing about \$3 million in cuts for 2004. The lab provides forecasts of solar storms for NASA, commercial aviation, the military and power companies.

Severe weather forecasts, long-term and seasonal climate changes also would suffer, MacDonald said. Similar to this year's cuts, this round also withholds a \$4.5 million appropriation for rent at NOAA.

The Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences—a partnership between the University of Colorado and NOAA—and other labs affiliated with NOAA stand to lose an estimated \$6.7 million, said agency Interim Director Koni Steffen.

"It's not something where you can just do less science—you have to lay off people," Steffen said. "Our reputation certainly is at stake here."

FEDS TO CUT RESEARCH DOLLARS  
(By Sarah-Jane Wilton)

Officials at the University of Colorado Boulder campus Tuesday called for action from the U.S. Senate to prevent massive cuts in federal funding for research labs across the state, many of which have strong ties with the university.

The U.S. Congress was scheduled to vote on the Commerce, Justice and State appropriations bill for the 2004 fiscal year Tuesday evening, which could see \$14 million cut from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) labs and from the National Institutes of Standards and Technology (NIST).

NOAA provides \$6.7 million in crucial funding for the Colorado Cooperative Institute for Research in the Environmental Sciences (CIRES), the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR), and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR).

CU could be one of 40 leading research universities with research projects funded by NOAA facing cuts.

According to Lawrence Pacheco, spokesman for Congressman Mark Udall, explained that \$4.5 million of NOAA's funding is used covering the organization's rent.

Pacheco said, "130 people will lose their jobs . . . from NOAA alone. Not only can they (cut the funding), they are doing it."

Pacheco said that Udall has been working with the research community to try to restore the funding.

Associate Vice Chancellor for Research at the Boulder campus, Carol Lynch, said that CU-Boulder would be impacted more directly by the cuts to NOAA than those to NIST, both of which have intimate relations with two of CU-Boulder institutes, CIRES and JILA.

"If NOAA is cut, it would maybe not destroy CIRES, but come close to it," said Lynch. "We would really have to restructure that institute into something significantly smaller."

Both CIRES and JILA are cooperative entities within the university, receiving block funding from NOAA as well as a share of lab resources and personnel.

"The cuts that (Congress) are proposing are just absolutely drastic," said Lynch.

Among other projects, NOAA conducts research in climate diagnostics that provide crucial understanding of global warming, weather and climate patterns and the impact of atmospheric conditions.

"This is not just fun and games sciences—this is really important areas of research," said Lynch.

Although Lynch was not sure of the exact amount of funding CIRES received, she thought it was well over half the institute's budget.

"If these cuts go through we will have a very different institute with far less ability to manage the science that they have been mandated to manage," said Lynch.

Lynch has not seen a detailed analysis on where cuts would come and which programs would be targeted. But she said much of the staff support was funded by grant-support from NOAA.

Cuts would also hinder the ability of CIRES to undertake new initiatives, such as the recent study on "Water in the West."

Lynch said serious budget cuts could impact the intellectual environment of the campus.

"I would worry about losing faculty," said Lynch. "We have some very high-quality faculty (working at CIRES)."

Undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral students have always had great support in

their research at CIRES, and this would also be in jeopardy, she said.

Chair of the Council of Boulder Laboratories Directors, Randall Dole, who is also Director of the Climate Diagnostics Center said that until the cuts were finalized it would be hard to say exactly how much staff would be laid off.

"This is not just a NOAA problem—frankly this is a Colorado problem," said Dole. "Because it seats back in the whole community, you could see the potential for manifold effects which go beyond the loss of 50-100 jobs."

Dole said there was no question of the impact the cuts would have on the volume and the rate of progress of research being conducted by the various organizations, much of which focuses greatly on the state's drought, ozone and climate issues.

Pacheco said he was certain Congress would approve the bill, the U.S. could amend it.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, over the last few months, I have met with local law enforcement in Utah and the message is loud and clear, COPS and Byrne grants are efficient and effective programs. As a result of these meetings, I fought hard to preserve some of the most basic and fundamental law enforcement funding mechanisms offered by the federal government.

The number one program that Utah law enforcement officers bring to my attention is the importance of the Byrne Grant program. This partnership among federal, state, and local

governments creates safer communities by providing funds for personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems for more widespread apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, detention, and rehabilitation of offenders who violate such state and local laws.

Another successful program is Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS. Since its inception in 1994, the COPS program has been one of the most successful law enforcement grant programs in American history. A central goal of the COPS Office is to help law enforcement agencies implement and enhance community-based policing, and this program in particular has been successful in Utah.

While I am pleased to see that the House Appropriations Committee provided \$683 million for the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS program, it deserves more funding. I am happy that the House Appropriations Committee funded the Byrne Formula Grants at \$500 million. This grant program is vital to local law enforcement in Utah. It is my hope that Congress and the Administration can recognize the value of these programs and that in the future we can work toward full funding.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the following table details budget authority of the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</b>					
<b>General Administration</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	90,477	133,772	106,664	+16,187	-27,108
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Joint automated booking system.....	15,869	---	---	-15,869	---
Automated Biometric Identification System-Integrated					
Identification system integration.....	8,941	---	---	-8,941	---
Identification systems integration.....	---	34,077	20,677	+20,677	-13,400
Legal activities office automation.....	15,838	---	30,136	+14,298	+30,136
Narrowband communications.....	63,936	140,083	103,171	+39,235	-36,912
Transfer from Treasury.....	7,391	---	---	-7,391	---
Counterterrorism fund.....	993	---	1,000	+7	+1,000
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Administrative review and appeals.....	190,290	197,420	193,530	+3,240	-3,890
Detention trustee.....	768,578	810,125	810,125	+41,547	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	40,000	---	---	-40,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	51,599	62,029	56,245	+4,646	-5,784
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	2,500	---	---	-2,500	---
Total, General administration.....	1,281,412	1,377,506	1,321,548	+40,136	-55,958
<b>United States Parole Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	10,420	11,051	10,609	+189	-442
<b>Legal Activities</b>					
General legal activities:					
Direct appropriation.....	605,368	663,350	618,537	+13,169	-44,813
Radiation exposure compensation act.....	1,983	---	---	-1,983	---
Non-defense.....	---	1,996	1,996	+1,996	---
Subtotal.....	607,351	665,346	620,533	+13,182	-44,813
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)....	4,002	4,028	4,028	+26	---
Legal activities office automation.....	---	33,240	---	---	-33,240
Antitrust Division.....	133,133	141,898	128,133	-5,000	-13,765
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-133,133	-112,000	-112,000	+21,133	---
Direct appropriation.....	---	29,898	16,133	+16,133	-13,765
United States Attorneys.....	1,493,993	1,556,784	1,526,253	+32,260	-30,531
United States Trustee System Fund.....	155,736	175,172	166,157	+10,421	-9,015
Offsetting fee collections.....	-149,736	-167,172	-158,157	-8,421	+9,015
Interest on U.S. securities.....	-6,000	-8,000	-8,000	-2,000	---
Direct appropriation.....	---	---	---	---	---
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	1,129	1,212	1,205	+76	-7
United States Marshals Service:					
Salaries and expenses (non-CSE).....	676,051	720,806	678,672	+2,621	-42,134
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
Construction.....	15,028	---	---	-15,028	---
Total, United States Marshals Service.....	699,079	720,806	678,672	-20,407	-42,134
Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	175,645	156,145	156,145	-19,500	---
Community Relations Service.....	9,412	9,526	9,526	+114	---
Assets forfeiture fund.....	21,759	22,949	21,759	---	-1,190
Total, Legal activities.....	3,012,370	3,199,934	3,034,254	+21,884	-165,680
<b>Interagency Law Enforcement</b>					
Interagency crime and drug enforcement.....	369,712	541,844	---	-369,712	-541,844

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Federal Bureau of Investigation</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,680,923	4,149,465	4,086,626	+405,703	-62,839
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	367,192	---	---	-367,192	---
Counterintelligence and national security.....	472,211	490,104	490,104	+17,893	---
Direct appropriation.....	4,520,326	4,639,569	4,576,730	+56,404	-62,839
Foreign terrorist tracking task force.....	61,597	---	61,597	---	+61,597
Construction.....	1,242	---	1,242	---	+1,242
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	4,583,165	4,639,569	4,639,569	+56,404	---
<b>Drug Enforcement Administration</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,639,223	1,677,304	1,719,888	+80,665	+42,584
Diversion control fund.....	-88,450	-118,561	-118,561	-30,111	---
Subtotal.....	1,550,773	1,558,743	1,601,327	+50,554	+42,584
Interagency drug enforcement.....	---	---	556,465	+556,465	+556,465
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration.....	1,550,773	1,558,743	2,157,792	+607,019	+599,049
<b>Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms</b>					
GREAT grants.....	12,915	13,000	---	-12,915	-13,000
Total.....	801,188	851,987	831,199	+30,011	-20,788
<b>Federal Prison System</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,044,788	4,677,214	4,461,257	+416,469	-215,957
Buildings and facilities.....	396,632	---	202,840	-193,792	+202,840
Rescission.....	---	-187,900	---	---	+187,900
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses).....	3,407	3,429	3,429	+22	---
Total, Federal Prison System.....	4,444,827	4,492,743	4,667,526	+222,699	+174,783
<b>Office of Justice Programs</b>					
Justice assistance.....	199,983	2,136,423	209,131	+9,148	-1,927,292
(By transfer).....	(6,632)	---	(6,632)	---	(+6,632)
Rescission.....	---	-11,622	---	---	+11,622
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	199,983	2,124,801	209,131	+9,148	-1,915,670
<b>State and local law enforcement assistance:</b>					
Local law enforcement block grant.....	397,400	---	400,000	+2,600	+400,000
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark).....	(79,480)	---	(80,000)	(+520)	(+80,000)
National Institute of Justice (earmark).....	(19,870)	---	(20,000)	(+130)	(+20,000)
USA FREEDOM corps (earmark).....	(2,981)	---	(5,000)	(+2,019)	(+5,000)
Indian assistance.....	17,883	---	13,000	-4,883	+13,000
Tribal prison construction.....	(4,968)	---	---	(-4,968)	---
Indian tribal courts program.....	(7,948)	---	(8,000)	(+52)	(+8,000)
Indian grants.....	(4,968)	---	(5,000)	(+32)	(+5,000)
State criminal alien assistance program.....	248,375	---	400,000	+151,625	+400,000
Cooperative agreement program.....	4,968	---	2,500	-2,468	+2,500
Byrne grants (formula).....	496,750	---	500,000	+3,250	+500,000
Byrne grants (discretionary).....	149,933	---	115,000	-34,933	+115,000
Juvenile crime block grant.....	188,765	---	---	-188,765	---
Drug courts.....	44,708	---	55,000	+10,292	+55,000
State prison drug treatment.....	64,577	---	70,000	+5,423	+70,000
Other crime control programs.....	5,653	---	5,361	-292	+5,361
Assistance for victims of trafficking.....	9,935	---	10,000	+65	+10,000
Violence against women prevention and prosecution.....	387,629	---	---	-387,629	---
Prescription drug monitoring.....	7,451	---	10,000	+2,549	+10,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Prison rape prevention.....	12,915	---	60,000	+47,085	+60,000
Terrorism prevention and response training.....	14,902	---	---	-14,902	---
Prior year unobligated balances.....	-20,854	---	---	+20,854	---
Total, State and local law enforcement.....	2,030,990	---	1,640,861	-390,129	+1,640,861
Weed and seed program fund.....	58,542	---	51,811	-6,731	+51,811
Community oriented policing services:					
Hiring.....	198,700	---	---	-198,700	---
Training and technical assistance.....	20,528	20,662	20,662	+134	---
Bullet proof vests.....	25,279	---	25,000	-279	+25,000
Tribal law enforcement.....	34,773	30,000	30,000	-4,773	---
Meth hot spots.....	56,761	20,000	60,000	+3,239	+40,000
Police corps.....	14,903	---	28,315	+13,412	+28,315
COPS technology.....	188,719	50,000	100,000	-88,719	+50,000
Interoperable communications.....	19,870	---	---	-19,870	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	54,750	---	---	-54,750	---
Criminal records upgrade.....	39,740	---	56,924	+17,184	+56,924
DNA backlog/crime lab.....	81,009	---	174,353	+93,344	+174,353
Paul Coverdell forensics science.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Crime identification technology.....	68,626	---	---	-68,626	---
Gun violence reduction.....	44,708	---	45,000	+292	+45,000
Southwest border prosecutors.....	39,740	---	40,000	+260	+40,000
Project sentry.....	9,935	---	---	-9,935	---
Offender reentry.....	14,837	---	13,504	-1,333	+13,504
Safe schools initiative.....	15,111	---	---	-15,111	---
Police integrity grants.....	16,853	16,963	17,000	+147	+37
DC Circuit Court and fugitive apprehension.....	---	---	41,105	+41,105	+41,105
Management and administration.....	32,782	26,130	26,130	-6,652	---
Rescission.....	---	-6,378	---	---	+6,378
Total, Community oriented policing services.....	977,624	157,377	682,993	-294,631	+525,616
Violence against women prevention and prosecution.....	---	---	387,629	+387,629	+387,629
Juvenile justice programs.....	273,517	---	462,282	+188,765	+462,282
(Transfer out).....	(-6,632)	---	(-6,632)	---	(-6,632)
Public safety officers benefits:					
Death benefits.....	49,054	49,054	49,054	---	---
Disability and education benefits.....	3,974	---	7,500	+3,526	+7,500
Total, Public safety officers benefits program..	53,028	49,054	56,554	+3,526	+7,500
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	3,593,684	2,331,232	3,491,261	-102,423	+1,160,029
Total, title I, Department of Justice.....	19,647,551	19,004,609	20,153,758	+506,207	+1,149,149
(Transfer out).....	(-6,632)	---	(-6,632)	---	(-6,632)
(By transfer).....	(6,632)	---	(6,632)	---	(+6,632)
=====					
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of the United States Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses.....	34,772	36,994	41,994	+7,222	+5,000
European communities music licensing dispute (P.L. 108-11).....	3,300	---	---	-3,300	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	53,649	58,295	57,000	+3,351	-1,295
Total, Related agencies.....	91,721	95,289	98,994	+7,273	+3,705
<hr/>					
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration.....	367,838	395,123	395,123	+27,285	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-8,000	-13,000	-13,000	-5,000	---
Direct appropriation.....	359,838	382,123	382,123	+22,285	---
Bureau of Industry and Security					
Operations and administration.....	59,088	78,169	61,000	+1,912	-17,169
CWC enforcement.....	7,203	---	7,203	---	+7,203
Total, Bureau of Industry and Security.....	66,291	78,169	68,203	+1,912	-9,966
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs.....	288,115	331,027	288,115	---	-42,912
Salaries and expenses.....	30,565	33,377	30,565	---	-2,812
Total, Economic Development Administration.....	318,680	364,404	318,680	---	-45,724
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority business development.....	28,718	29,487	29,000	+282	-487
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development.....	865,248	949,472	897,000	+31,752	-52,472
<hr/>					
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE					
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses.....	71,689	84,756	75,000	+3,311	-9,756
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses.....	181,811	220,908	220,908	+39,097	---
Periodic censuses and programs.....	369,067	441,053	441,053	+71,986	---
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	550,878	661,961	661,961	+111,083	---
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	14,604	18,869	14,604	---	-4,265
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction.....	43,273	2,538	2,538	-40,735	---
Information infrastructure grants.....	15,402	---	15,402	---	+15,402
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.....	73,279	21,407	32,544	-40,735	+11,137
United States Patent and Trademark Office					
Current year fee funding.....	1,015,229	1,203,055	1,138,700	+123,471	-64,355
Prior year carryover.....	166,771	---	100,000	-66,771	+100,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
New fees (proposed legislation).....	---	192,000	---	---	-192,000
Total, Patent and Trademark Office.....	1,182,000	1,395,055	1,238,700	+56,700	-156,355
Offsetting fee collections.....	-1,015,229	-1,203,055	-1,238,700	-223,471	-35,645
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure..	862,617	960,124	769,505	-93,112	-190,619
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
Technology Administration					
Office of Technology Policy					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,822	8,015	7,822	-2,000	-193
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services.....	357,075	379,849	357,862	+787	-21,987
Industrial technology services.....	284,760	39,607	39,607	-245,153	---
Construction of research facilities.....	65,670	69,590	62,590	-3,080	-7,000
Working capital fund.....	---	7,772	---	---	-7,772
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	707,505	496,818	460,059	-247,446	-36,759
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities.....	2,298,481	2,389,300	2,180,454	-118,027	-208,846
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund).....	(65,000)	(75,000)	(79,251)	(+14,251)	(+4,251)
(By transfer from Coastal zone management).....	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Operations, research, and facilities.....	2,298,481	2,392,300	2,180,454	-118,027	-211,846
Procurement, acquisition and construction.....	754,096	842,399	794,059	+39,963	-48,340
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	65,000	---	---	-65,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Procurement, acquisition and construction	819,096	842,399	794,059	-25,037	-48,340
Pacific coastal salmon recovery.....	129,155	90,000	90,000	-39,155	---
Coastal zone management fund.....	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	---	---
Fishermen's contingency fund.....	1	956	---	-1	-956
Foreign fishing observer fund.....	1	191	---	-1	-191
Fisheries finance program account.....	-8,000	-4,000	-7,000	+1,000	-3,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	3,235,734	3,318,846	3,054,513	-181,221	-264,333
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Science and Technology.....	3,953,061	3,823,679	3,522,394	-430,667	-301,285
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Departmental Management					
Salaries and expenses.....	44,662	57,191	44,662	---	-12,529
		13,378	22,000	+1,499	-1,378
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Departmental management.....	65,163	80,569	66,662	+1,499	-13,907
Tourism promotion (sec. 210).....	49,675	---	---	-49,675	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Department of Commerce.....	5,704,043	5,718,555	5,156,567	-547,476	-561,988
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies.....	5,795,764	5,813,844	5,255,561	-540,203	-558,283
Appropriations.....	(5,795,764)	(5,813,844)	(5,255,561)	(-540,203)	(-558,283)
(By transfer).....	(65,000)	(75,000)	(79,251)	(+14,251)	(+4,251)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices.....	1,872	1,896	1,896	+24	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	43,586	55,581	53,464	+9,878	-2,117
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	1,535	---	---	-1,535	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	46,993	57,477	55,360	+8,367	-2,117
Care of the building and grounds.....	41,355	4,658	10,591	-30,764	+5,933
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	88,348	62,135	65,951	-22,397	+3,816
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	2,225	2,237	2,237	+12	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	17,970	20,185	18,428	+458	-1,757
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	973	---	---	-973	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	21,168	22,422	20,665	-503	-1,757
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	1,678	1,721	1,721	+43	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	11,931	12,485	12,347	+416	-138
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	50	---	---	-50	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	13,659	14,206	14,068	+409	-138
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges.....	263,854	274,504	274,504	+10,650	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	3,513,161	3,913,848	3,729,672	+216,511	-184,176
Direct appropriation.....	3,777,015	4,188,352	4,004,176	+227,161	-184,176
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.....	2,766	3,293	3,293	+527	---
Defender services.....	534,961	635,481	613,948	+78,987	-21,533
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	54,281	53,181	53,181	-1,100	---
Court security.....	266,655	311,171	288,941	+22,286	-22,230
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services.....	4,635,678	5,191,478	4,963,539	+327,861	-227,939
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses.....	63,087	71,908	66,968	+3,881	-4,940
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses.....	20,720	21,660	21,440	+720	-220
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds.....	35,300	29,000	29,000	-6,300	---
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	12,011	13,200	12,746	+735	-454

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
General Provisions					
Judges pay raise (sec. 304).....	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title III, the Judiciary.....	4,889,971	5,430,009	5,194,377	+304,406	-235,632
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	3,248,008	3,516,843	3,453,260	+205,252	-63,583
(Transfer out).....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	98,420	---	---	-98,420	---
Worldwide security upgrades.....	549,405	646,701	646,701	+97,296	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs.....	3,895,833	4,163,544	4,099,961	+204,128	-63,583
Capital investment fund.....	182,119	157,000	142,000	-40,119	-15,000
Office of Inspector General.....	29,074	31,703	29,777	+703	-1,926
Educational and cultural exchange programs.....	243,712	345,346	345,346	+101,634	---
Representation allowances.....	6,443	9,000	9,000	+2,557	---
Protection of foreign missions and officials.....	10,929	10,000	10,000	-929	---
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance.....	505,195	653,000	532,935	+27,740	-120,065
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	149,500	---	---	-149,500	---
Worldwide security upgrades.....	750,093	861,400	861,400	+111,307	---
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service....	6,458	1,000	1,000	-5,458	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
(By transfer).....	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	---	---
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	608	612	612	+4	---
Administrative expenses.....	603	607	607	+4	---
(By transfer).....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Repatriation loans program account.....	1,211	1,219	1,219	+8	---
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan.....	18,330	19,773	18,782	+452	-991
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	138,200	134,979	134,979	-3,221	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	5,987,097	6,387,964	6,186,399	+199,302	-201,565
International Organizations					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment.....	860,371	1,010,463	1,010,463	+150,092	---
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year.....	669,331	550,200	550,200	-119,131	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, International Organizations and Conferences.....	1,529,702	1,560,663	1,560,663	+30,961	---
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses.....	25,316	31,562	25,668	+352	-5,894
Construction.....	5,415	8,901	5,500	+85	-3,401
American sections, international commissions.....	9,410	11,204	8,944	-466	-2,260
International fisheries commissions.....	16,989	20,043	16,989	---	-3,054
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, International commissions.....	57,130	71,710	57,101	-29	-14,609
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	10,376	9,250	10,376	---	+1,126
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship program.....	497	500	500	+3	---
Israeli Arab scholarship program.....	373	375	375	+2	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
East-West Center.....	17,883	14,280	---	-17,883	-14,280
National Endowment for Democracy.....	41,727	36,000	42,000	+273	+6,000
Total, Department of State.....	7,644,785	8,080,742	7,857,414	+212,629	-223,328
RELATED AGENCY					
Broadcasting Board of Governors					
International Broadcasting Operations.....	465,850	525,204	552,105	+86,255	+26,901
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	30,500	---	---	-30,500	---
Broadcasting to Cuba.....	24,834	26,901	---	-24,834	-26,901
Broadcasting capital improvements.....	12,657	11,395	11,395	-1,262	---
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors.....	533,841	563,500	563,500	+29,659	---
Total, title IV, Department of State.....	8,178,626	8,644,242	8,420,914	+242,288	-223,328
(Transfer out).....	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	---	---
(By transfer).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES					
Antitrust Modernization Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	---	1,499	+1,499	+1,499
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses.....	496	499	499	+3	---
Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,037	9,096	9,096	+59	---
Commission on International Religious Freedom					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,865	3,000	3,000	+135	---
Commission on Ocean Policy					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,987	---	---	-1,987	---
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,572	1,615	1,615	+43	---
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,371	1,800	1,800	+429	---
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	306,815	334,754	328,400	+21,585	-6,354
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	15,000	---	---	-15,000	---
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	270,987	280,798	278,958	+7,971	-1,840
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-269,000	-251,984	-269,000	---	-17,016
Direct appropriation.....	1,987	28,814	9,958	+7,971	-18,856

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	176,553	191,132	183,041	+6,488	-8,091
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-150,000	-112,000	-112,000	+38,000	---
Offsetting fee collections, telephone database....	-18,100	-18,000	-20,100	-2,000	-2,100
-----					
Direct appropriation.....	8,453	61,132	50,941	+42,488	-10,191
Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation.....	336,645	329,300	338,848	+2,203	+9,548
Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,030	1,856	1,856	-1,174	---
National Commission on Terrorism Attacks Upon the United States					
Salaries and expenses (P.L. 108-11).....	11,000	---	---	-11,000	---
National Veterans Business Development Corporation					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,987	2,000	2,000	+13	---
Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	745,789	841,507	841,500	+95,711	-7
Prior year unobligated balances.....	-29,439	---	-103,000	-73,561	-103,000
-----					
Direct appropriation.....	716,350	841,507	738,500	+22,150	-103,007
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	312,413	360,155	326,592	+14,179	-33,563
Office of Inspector General.....	12,341	14,500	13,000	+659	-1,500
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	3,702	1,910	1,910	-1,792	---
Guaranteed loans subsidy.....	84,805	94,860	84,805	---	-10,055
Administrative expenses.....	128,161	129,000	129,000	+839	---
-----					
Total, Business loans program account.....	216,668	225,770	215,715	-953	-10,055
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	72,665	79,109	72,665	---	-6,444
Administrative expenses.....	117,585	118,354	117,585	---	-769
Gainsharing.....	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000
-----					
Total, Disaster loans program account.....	190,250	200,463	190,250	---	-10,213
-----					
Total, Small Business Administration.....	731,672	800,888	745,557	+13,885	-55,331
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,981	---	3,000	+19	+3,000
=====					
Total, title V, Related agencies.....	2,153,248	2,416,261	2,236,569	+83,321	-179,692
=====					
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Working Capital fund (rescission).....	-78,000	---	---	+78,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2799)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Legal Activities					
Assets forfeiture fund (rescission).....	-50,874	---	---	+50,874	---
Office of Justice Programs					
State & local law enforcement assistance (rescission).....	---	---	-24,122	-24,122	-24,122
Community oriented policing services (rescission).....	---	---	-6,378	-6,378	-6,378
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
Immigration emergency fund (rescission).....	-580	---	---	+580	---
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Coastal impact assistance (rescission).....	-7,000	---	---	+7,000	---
Departmental Management					
Emergency oil and gas guaranteed loan program account (rescission).....	-920	---	---	+920	---
Emergency steel guaranteed loan program account (rescission).....	---	-97,000	---	---	+97,000
RELATED AGENCIES					
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses (rescission).....	-5,700	---	---	+5,700	---
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses (rescission).....	-13,750	---	---	+13,750	---
Business Loans Program Account:					
Guaranteed loans subsidy (rescission).....	-10,500	---	---	+10,500	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title VII, Rescissions.....	-167,324	-97,000	-30,500	+136,824	+66,500
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	40,497,836	41,211,965	41,230,679	+732,843	+18,714
Appropriations.....	(40,665,160)	(41,514,865)	(41,261,179)	(+596,019)	(-253,686)
Rescissions.....	(-167,324)	(-302,900)	(-30,500)	(+136,824)	(+272,400)
(Transfer out).....	(-11,632)	(-5,000)	(-11,632)	---	(-6,632)
(By transfer).....	(76,632)	(80,000)	(90,883)	(+14,251)	(+10,883)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, our nation is facing a protracted economic downturn, and manufacturers have been particularly hard hit. It is crucial that the federal government assists the smaller manufacturing businesses, which contribute significantly to the economy. This is why I support the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, program.

Many small businesses in my home state of Utah have benefited substantially from the MEP. I believe that if the federal government is content to merely study the problems of manufacturers, without providing a plan of action or tangible assistance, then our efforts to improve local economies will necessarily fall short.

While I am pleased to see that the House Appropriations Committee provided \$39.6 million for MEP, I hope that this worthy program will receive full funding during Senate consideration. Our government has devised and implemented an excellent resource for manufacturers and I believe that it deserves the continued support of Congress and the administration. Thank you for your consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2799) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 326, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 21, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Blunt
Aderholt	Bass	Boehlert
Alexander	Beauprez	Boehner
Allen	Becerra	Bonilla
Andrews	Bell	Bonner
Baca	Bereuter	Bono
Bachus	Berman	Boozman
Baird	Berry	Boswell
Baker	Biggart	Boucher
Baldwin	Bilirakis	Boyd
Ballance	Bishop (GA)	Bradley (NH)
Ballenger	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Blackburn	Brady (TX)

Brown (OH)	Granger	McHugh
Brown (SC)	Graves	McIntyre
Brown, Corrine	Green (TX)	McKeon
Brown-Waite,	Greenwood	McNulty
Ginny	Grijalva	Meehan
Burgess	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Burns	Hall	Meeks (NY)
Burr	Harman	Menendez
Burton (IN)	Harris	Mica
Buyer	Hart	Michaud
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Camp	Hastings (WA)	McDonald
Cannon	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Capito	Herger	Miller (NC)
Capps	Hill	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Hinchev	Miller, George
Cardin	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Cardoza	Hobson	Moore
Carson (IN)	Hoeffel	Moran (KS)
Carson (OK)	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Carter	Holden	Murphy
Case	Holt	Murtha
Castle	Honda	Myrick
Chabot	Hooley (OR)	Nadler
Chocola	Hostettler	Napolitano
Clay	Houghton	Neal (MA)
Clyburn	Hoyer	Nethercutt
Coble	Hulshof	Neugebauer
Cole	Hunter	Ney
Collins	Hyde	Northup
Conyers	Inslee	Nunes
Cooper	Isakson	Nussle
Cox	Israel	Oberstar
Cramer	Issa	Obey
Crane	Istook	Oliver
Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Osborne
Cubin	(TX)	Ose
Culberson	Janklow	Otter
Cummings	Jefferson	Owens
Cunningham	Jenkins	Pallone
Davis (AL)	John	Pascarell
Davis (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Davis (FL)	Johnson (IL)	Payne
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Davis (TN)	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Davis, Jo Ann	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Davis, Tom	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)
Deal (GA)	Kaptur	Petri
DeFazio	Keller	Pickering
DeGette	Kelly	Pitts
Delahunt	Kennedy (MN)	Platts
DeLauro	Kildee	Pombo
DeLay	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
DeMint	Kind	Porter
Deutsch	King (IA)	Portman
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Putnam
Dicks	Kirk	Quinn
Dingell	Kleczka	Radanovich
Doggett	Kline	Rahall
Dooley (CA)	Knollenberg	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kolbe	Rangel
Doyle	Kucinich	Regula
Dreier	LaHood	Rehberg
Dunn	Lampson	Renzi
Edwards	Langevin	Reyes
Ehlers	Lantos	Reynolds
Emanuel	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Engel	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
English	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Eshoo	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Etheridge	Leach	Rohrabacher
Evans	Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	Levin	Ross
Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rothman
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Roybal-Allard
Feeney	Linder	Ruppersberger
Filner	Lipinski	Rush
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Ryan (OH)
Foley	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Lowe	Ryun (KS)
Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Sabo
Frank (MA)	Lucas (OK)	Sanchez, Linda
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	T.
Frost	Majette	Sanchez, Loretta
Galeggly	Maloney	Sanders
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Sandlin
Gerlach	Markey	Saxton
Gibbons	Marshall	Schakowsky
Gilchrest	Matheson	Schiff
Gillmor	Matsui	Schrock
Gingrey	McCarthy (MO)	Scott (GA)
Gonzalez	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Goode	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCrery	Serrano
Gordon	McDermott	Sessions
Goss	McGovern	Shadegg

Shaw	Stupak	Walden (OR)
Shays	Sweeney	Wamp
Sherman	Tanner	Waters
Sherwood	Tauscher	Watson
Shimkus	Taylor (NC)	Watt
Shuster	Terry	Waxman
Simmons	Thomas	Weiner
Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (FL)
Skellton	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (PA)
Slaughter	Thornberry	Weller
Smith (MI)	Tiahrt	Wexler
Smith (NJ)	Tiberi	Whitfield
Smith (TX)	Tierney	Wicker
Smith (WA)	Toomey	Wilson (NM)
Snyder	Towns	Wilson (SC)
Solis	Turner (OH)	Wolf
Souder	Turner (TX)	Woolsey
Spratt	Udall (NM)	Wu
Stark	Upton	Wynn
Stearns	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Stenholm	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Strickland	Vitter	

NAYS—21

Akin	Hensarling	Pence
Costello	Jones (NC)	Royce
Duncan	McCarthy (NY)	Tancred
Flake	McInnis	Tauzin
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	Taylor (MS)
Green (WI)	Oxley	Udall (CO)
Hefley	Paul	Van Hollen

NOT VOTING—13

Berkley	Gephardt	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Gutknecht	Sullivan
Emerson	Kennedy (RI)	Walsh
Ferguson	Lewis (GA)	
Ford	Norwood	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1523

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 422, I mistakenly thought I had already voted. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2800, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 327 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2800.

□ 1525

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2800) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present, at long last I should say, present H.R. 2800, the Foreign Operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004. In almost all the instances that we will see here today, this is a joint recommendation, which means that there are compromises that are made on both sides; and it is one of which I am very proud.

I am very proud to have worked with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my colleague, the ranking member from the minority side. Working with her has been absolutely a joy. She has been wonderful in her spirit of trying to find a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. It is in that spirit, I believe, that this bill is presented today; and I want to thank her and her staff for the tireless work that they have done on this bill.

I might add, I want to thank the staff that surrounds me here, led by the able Clerk of our subcommittee, Charlie Flickner, and my personal staff for the extraordinary work that they have done to get us to where we are today.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee's recommendation for fiscal year 2004 foreign assistance and export financing funding is \$17.1 billion. That is \$1.7 billion below the administration's request. We worked to accommodate as many of the Members' interests as possible, while keeping in mind the broader national and international situation.

In the papers, on TV, in the streets, we are faced daily with the ramifications of the issues that are covered by this bill. This bill provides vital funding to fight wars against disease and drugs, for building peace and democracy, and for building economic prosperity around the world.

The President's trip to Africa a few weeks ago highlighted the opportunity we have this year to embark on a bold new direction in international assistance. During his trip, the President championed initiatives to address two of the greatest problems facing our world today, persistent poverty and HIV/AIDS. The Millennium Challenge Account and the emergency plans for AIDS relief are the most innovative programs that we have seen in decades that reshape foreign assistance.

The Millennium Challenge Account will provide an incentive for countries to build a political and economic infrastructure which leads to long-term development, which leads to sustainable development, which leads to the improvement in the lives of the citizens of the countries involved.

The AIDS initiative will bring medicine and care and hope to millions of people. The very promise of care and treatment has already brought hope to millions.

These initiatives may be innovative new approaches, but the work of our subcommittee has not changed. We must distribute the resources that are allotted to us, resources that are never quite enough, across a wide range of competing priorities. We have to make difficult choices among deserving programs, and we are charged with ensuring that taxpayer money is spent wisely and efficiently. We all must remember that effective programs require a firm foundation and good management.

This year we have once again provided more funds than the President requests for HIV/AIDS, for its prevention, treatment, care and support. Our bill recommends \$1.43 billion for HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Add to that the \$645 million that was recommended by the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies and that the House approved last week, this body now proposes to spend nearly \$2.1 billion for these three diseases, an amount that more than meets the President's request of \$2.04 billion.

This \$2 billion represents the first installment of \$15 billion to be spent against these three diseases over the next 5 years. Let me make that crystal clear. This administration and this subcommittee and, I believe, this Congress are fully committed to spending \$15 billion on prevention and life-saving treatments for those afflicted with AIDS around the world. This \$2 billion that is in these two bills, last week and here today on the floor, is only our first installment in that program.

□ 1530

Now, the Millennium Challenge Account is a new component of our bill this year. I fully support the MCA. I am excited about it. I believe it can make our investments in developing assistance more effective and more sustainable. Our bill recommends \$800 billion for the MCA, or Millennium Challenge Account, and we believe that is the amount that can be effectively spent in fiscal year 2004.

Of course, in future years more resources are going to be needed to fight HIV/AIDS and to support the initiatives of the MCA. I have confidence that the Congress will meet the 5-year pledge for AIDS and that additional funds will be forthcoming to support the creative delivery of foreign assistance through the MCA in years ahead. But it is the very size of the task facing us over the coming years that

counsels patience today. Our recommendations for the HIV/AIDS initiative and for the MCA are the first steps in two very ambitious, very innovative, and very new programs. With this \$2 billion the House provides for AIDS this coming year, agencies can build a solid framework to support the \$13 billion that will follow. With our \$800 million for the Millennium Challenge Account, we will have a structure that can effectively and wisely use the added \$5 billion in development assistance that the President has pledged to put on top of existing development assistance. But our recommendation is not so extravagant, Mr. Chairman, that money will lay waiting to be spent, gathering pressure that might lead to waste and to unwise expenditures, eroding public confidence in these two initiatives.

Some of our colleagues are pressing to take even more, to move money into AIDS from the MCA for other programs. Such an approach, Mr. Chairman, would, in my opinion, be an unwise one. What we have provided for the President's new HIV/AIDS initiative is prudent, when we consider that the coordinator, who has been named for these programs in the State Department, has not yet been confirmed by the Senate. Taking more money from the MCA would signal a lack of confidence in the approach of the MCA. We should instead be recognizing the President for his vision, and \$800 million to launch this program is an appropriate level.

The final priority I want to mention in this bill is funding for Israel, Egypt, and Jordan. This funding accounts for nearly \$5 billion of the total. Let me add that the major refugee account and the key military assistance accounts, so vital in our war against terrorism and to protect our national security, are all fully funded.

Of course, the funding priorities I have laid out for my colleagues add up to more than the increase in our budget allocation. So the subcommittee has gone to great lengths to avoid reducing appropriations in order to make room for the AIDS emergency plan and the Millennium Challenge Account, and for the admirable commitment of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) to improving basic education globally. Within Child Survival and Health, we have succeeded in holding the levels for Child Survival and Maternal Health, for Vulnerable Children, for Family Planning and Reproductive Health, and our unrestricted grant to UNICEF at last year's level.

Our funding for international funding institutions, the Economic Support Fund, which is used by the State Department and the President to support economic development assistance around the world, and two of the President's lesser initiatives, has been reduced or eliminated to accommodate the initiatives within the allocation that was given to us.

Separately, I would note that there is no money in this bill for the reconstruction in Iraq. None has been requested by the administration. Although many of us expect and many of us heard yesterday from Ambassador Bremer that more money may well be required shortly, we will await a Presidential decision on this matter.

In closing, let me say, and I say this with some confidence, that this is a good bill, one which I believe that all Members can be proud of and which I hope will have the support of all the Members of this body. It is fiscally responsible. It is within the subcommittee's budget allocation. It is a bill that helps to lay the groundwork for the important work that is ahead of us as we launch these major initiatives in development assistance and HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment. It is a bill that meets our challenges overseas and impacts the national security of this Nation. I urge the Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), a good friend, who has worked very closely with me, and I appreciate our extremely cooperative relationship. I also want to thank the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I appreciate the leadership he provides to this committee.

And I want to say at the outset that while Chairman KOLBE and I may differ fundamentally on the adequacy of our allocation he certainly accommodated most of my priorities, and I believe we have a bill that indeed is worthy of Members' support, despite the fact that we had to cut \$1.7 billion from the President's request, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The bill contains \$17.1 billion, which is an increase of \$900 million over last year, and I generally agree with my chairman on the spending levels recommended for specific accounts within the reduced allocation. We did work together closely to ensure that in the face of devastating cuts we at least level funded Child Survival and Health accounts and increased education as a priority area. We provided funding for reconstruction in Afghanistan, an issue on which the chairman and I have collaborated often in the last year. The bill also funds fully our commitments in the Middle East, a powerful statement at such a critical time in the peace process. And there are many more very positive aspects I will discuss further in a moment.

I do have some concerns as well. At the \$17 billion spending level, we as a country will devote less than 1 percent of our GDP to foreign assistance. Actual spending in 2003 for foreign aid will total over \$23 billion, including \$7.5 billion in emergency supplemental

funding for war-related needs in Iraq and Afghanistan. That additional spending sped through Congress without a hint of controversy because it was judged vital to our national security. As the conflict and reconstruction continue in Iraq on parallel tracks, there is a good chance we will need more, and Members should know that there are no funds in this bill to address Iraq reconstruction needs. This means that those additional needs will be addressed in a supplemental, which will undoubtedly also contain billions to fund the defense-related costs of the war and which will again be requested by the President as emergency spending.

I do believe that our response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic is underfunded and should be dealt with as the emergency it is now. In response to the President's extraordinary initiative on HIV/AIDS, Congress overwhelmingly passed and the President signed a bill authorizing \$3 billion for fiscal year 2004. While in Africa 2 weeks ago, the President repeatedly touted this \$15 billion 5-year plan, and he and his advisers called on Congress to fund it. This created the impression that we the Congress were the obstacle to providing \$3 billion, despite the fact that the President himself only requested \$2 billion in appropriations.

Now, while I am pleased that this bill provides \$1.43 billion for HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, we supported the \$3 billion authorization on this floor in this Congress, and now the bill has come due. I believe it is disingenuous for us to make promises we have no intention of keeping, and so I offered an amendment at full committee to provide an additional \$1 billion for HIV/AIDS as emergency spending. I asked that this amendment be made in order under the rule so every Member of Congress would have the opportunity to fulfill our pledge, but it was not. It is truly a disgrace, in my judgment, that we will not have the opportunity to take this vote today.

Additional resources for Africa are also vitally needed. Everyone is aware of the long history of devastating and destabilizing humanitarian and political crises on that continent. And although this bill will slightly increase resources for Africa above last year, it merely begins to address the ongoing tragedies there. Unfortunately, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) to add emergency resources for Africa was also not made in order.

The sad fact is that we as a Nation have neglected the problems of Africa for decades; chronic poverty, the spread of infectious disease, and lack of good governance remain. And despite all the efforts we have undertaken so far across many Congresses and administrations, we must no longer shy away from addressing these problems with sufficient resources and political will.

It serves no one when the current presidential initiatives are touted as

ultimate answers for these tragedies. Both the Millennium Challenge Account, MCA, and the HIV initiative hold the promise of getting increased resources to Africa, but the actual effects they will have remain unclear.

I support the conceptual approach embodied in the proposal to establish a Millennium Challenge Account, however, budget realities we face this year, and will likely face next year, make it highly unlikely that the promise made by the President that the \$10 billion intended for the MCA will be additive to current levels of foreign assistance will be kept. Much of the bipartisan support in Congress for the MCA is based on the fact that it is supposed to help the poorest countries of the world and that MCA resources will add to amounts currently spent on foreign assistance. Cuts to discretionary spending in this year's budget resolution, combined with unrealistically low budget requests for many domestic programs, have translated into cuts in this bill of \$1.7 billion. This situation is likely to worsen in fiscal year 2005. The President cannot expect Congress to support full funding of the MCA initiative if other vital programs in the foreign operations bill have to be cut.

The bill contains \$800 million for the MCA, largely at the insistence of the White House; the Senate bill contains \$1 billion for MCA; and the White House is still pushing for the full \$1.3 billion requested. It is highly likely that the final allocation for the foreign operations bill will be \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion below the President's request. Now, in plain English, this means that other accounts in the bill will be cut severely if MCA is fully funded.

Members should also know that only 3 of 11 potentially qualifying countries for MCA resources in 2004 are in Africa. In 2005, of the 12 countries most likely to qualify, again, only 3 are in Africa. In all, after \$2 billion over 3 years is provided to the MCA, only a small number are African countries are likely to have benefitted.

I have taken the time in my opening remarks to address this situation because this initiative marks the beginning of a shift in how we in Congress effect foreign aid programming. As we provide more resources for MCA, our ability to direct funds to specific purposes, such as health and education, will diminish significantly. My support for this initiative going forward will thus depend on whether resources going to it are truly additive and whether Congress maintains some measure of control and oversight over country eligibility and program planning.

□ 1545

I am especially proud, and I want to personally thank the gentleman from Arizona for the \$350 million in the bill for basic education, which is \$100 million above last year's level. In addition, we require a detailed report on how the administration will organize and implement our expanded efforts in basic

education. Virtually everyone I speak to agrees that providing more and more focused resources for basic education throughout the world is one of the best possible ways we can combat the extremism and hopelessness that breed terrorism. I again want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for working with me on what I think is a very critical issue.

The bill also provides an increase in resources for Treasury technical assistance which will help countries that are major source and transit points for terrorist financing close the gaping holes in their financial systems that let this funding slip through.

However, the fact that we took care of administration priorities such as the Millennium Challenge Account and AIDS required that we make some hard choices. As a result, some programs will suffer. There is no funding recommended for debt relief for the Democratic Republic of Congo. Cuts in economic support funds, Eastern Europe, the New Independent States, and development assistance translate into probable cuts to many countries and a limited capacity to restore misguided cuts proposed by the administration to others, including Cyprus, East Timor, Armenia, Ukraine, and Russia.

Mr. Chairman, as a final note, I want to make a few comments about the importance of this bill we consider on the floor today. I have always viewed foreign assistance as one of the three pillars of national security, along with defense and diplomacy. I believe the value of foreign assistance in spreading the ideals of democracy and freedom around the world and in eliminating the poverty that causes widespread instability in developing regions cannot be underestimated. However, except for a handful of notable instances directly linked to front-page current events, it has been difficult to ensure adequate funding for foreign aid priorities. Despite the new Presidential initiatives in this bill, and again I want to congratulate the President on these initiatives, this year, unfortunately, is no different. We still require far more resources than have been made available. I look forward to working with my colleagues in future years to ensure our priorities are adequately funded.

In closing, I once again want to emphasize that I appreciate the close working relationship I have enjoyed with the gentleman from Arizona. He is a distinguished chairman, he is committed to this bill, and it truly has been a pleasure for me to work with our chairman. Considering the obstacles we faced, the product we present today is very good. I look forward to working with him as we move the process forward. I would also like to thank our able staff, Mark Murray, Charlie Flickner, Alice Grant, Scott Gudes, Rob Blair, Lori Maes, Sean Mulvaney, Beth Titter, and Joe Weinstein, for their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the full committee, who, I must say, along with his staff, has been so supportive of our efforts in getting us to the floor at this stage. I am very grateful for his confidence and his support.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I want to compliment him for having done a tremendous job. This is not the easiest bill to pass because a lot of folks just do not like foreign aid. Period. The chairman has developed a very responsible response to the issues that are facing us around the world. He has done a really good job. I would say that the gentlewoman from New York, as a working partner, has been very much a contributor to the success of this bill.

I hope that we can conclude this bill today. We will see how long it takes. But it would be nice if we could. Although the committee got off to a late start this year, we passed the ninth appropriations bill just about an hour ago, the Commerce-Justice-State Department appropriations bill. This will be the 10th bill that we have passed on the floor despite a late start. As of tomorrow morning, we will have marked up all 13 appropriations bills in the full committee and we completed 11 of last year's bills early this year, and we marked up two supplementals. So the committee has been very effective and very busy this year. This bill is the culmination of a strong effort by the gentleman from Arizona and the gentlewoman from New York to meet the responsibilities that we have in the world. I compliment them. They have done a really good job. I think that they join me in hoping that we can conclude the tenth appropriations bill before it gets too late tonight.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a distinguished member of our committee who has made sure that we focus on our priorities every day he is there.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and the subcommittee staff for their hard work. I think they did a reasonable job, considering the amount of money they had allocated to them.

Mr. Chairman, the President requested \$18.8 billion for the accounts that make up the foreign operations bill. Unfortunately, the leadership of the House only gave the bill \$17.1 billion. That is where our problems began. From the outset, we were forced into a position of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The President's top priorities are to fund the Millennium Challenge Ac-

count, MCA, and his bilateral HIV/AIDS initiative. To fully fund the MCA and the HIV/AIDS initiative would take up almost 25 percent of this bill's allocation. Leadership and legislating require making tough choices, but that is not the whole story here. We have the ability and the resources to adequately fund these accounts. We have chosen not to. Over the last 3 years, Congress has chosen to provide tax cuts decreasing revenue by \$310 billion for the 2004 fiscal year. We have chosen to provide \$8.9 billion for a ballistic missile defense system that will not work. We have chosen to ignore the type of rampant poverty, illness and hopelessness in sub-Saharan Africa that create a breeding ground for terrorism.

Africa today, Mr. Chairman, is in a state of emergency. This bill makes a valiant attempt but falls short of addressing this emergency in sub-Saharan Africa. The Congress' approach has been disjointed. In 1999, this Congress said "trade, not aid" in the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, that trade was Africa's future. Today Congress says aid, yes, but aid for AIDS. Africa deserves more than a hedgepodge, disjointed approach to its development. An emergency exists on the continent. Africa is the poorest region of the world, containing a majority of the world's poorest countries. Only one in three people in sub-Saharan Africa get enough to eat every day, and one out of two do not have access to clean drinking water. An emergency.

Only one in three children completes elementary school. An emergency.

Average life expectancy in Africa is just 49 years of age and in countries hardest hit by AIDS, just 30. An emergency.

While poverty has fallen in much of the rest of the world, 20 African countries are poorer today than they were 20 years ago. An emergency.

Overwhelming debt burdens, falling international development assistance levels, the onslaught of AIDS, and a combination of falling prices for Africa's exports and unfair international trade policies are pushing Africa backwards, stealing the gains of a generation of hardworking African people. An emergency.

Africa is now at the epicenter of the greatest catastrophe in recorded human history, the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) will offer an amendment which I hope all Members of this Congress will support to fully fund the President's AIDS initiative. Since its first discovery 2 decades ago, more than 18 million Africans have died of AIDS out of 25 million AIDS deaths worldwide.

All day, Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear Members of the Congress come to the floor and say, We are doing something for AIDS. We are helping the Africans. We are doing something. We are showing something for Africa. But what about this bill addresses the

more than 300 million people in sub-Saharan Africa who survive on under \$1 per day? AIDS has nothing to do with that massive economic inequality. Infant and child mortality rates remain high, AIDS notwithstanding; and access to health care and education is shrinking in many countries. Food insecurity is growing, most seriously in southern Africa and in the horn of Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa's massive external debt is the single largest obstacle to the continent's economic development, not the criteria established by the Millennium Challenge Corporation or the Millennium Challenge Account. We will hear other Members of Congress come to the floor and say, The Millennium Challenge Account, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, we are doing something through the MCA. Out of 48 sub-Saharan African countries, only three qualify for the benefits offered by the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

I have laid out many of the statistics about the crisis on the continent, an emergency in Africa. But my colleagues would come and say, We are doing something because we are talking about AIDS. We are not discussing development and growth; we are not talking about a Marshall Plan for Africa. And this bill woefully undermines the amount of resources that this Congress could provide.

Over the past 2 decades, African governments have paid out more in debt service than they have received in development assistance or new loans. My colleagues are going to come to the floor and say, We are doing something for Africa in terms of development assistance and loans. Here is the problem. Too few African countries will be benefiting from U.S. development assistance in the midst of a severe emergency on the continent. The MCA is the equivalent of saying, Africa, do what we want you to do and we will relate to you. But if you do not do what we want you to do, we will have no relationship to you at all in the midst of a profound emergency. Debt repayments divert money directly from spending on basic social needs, including the response to the HIV/AIDS crisis, trapping countries in a cycle of underdevelopment and dependency. From 1990 to 2000, sub-Saharan Africa experienced more than twice the number of casualties from conflict than any other region in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I close on this note. In Sudan, Africa's largest country, civil war has raged for 36 of the last 46 years. It has cost more than 2 million lives and has displaced more than 4 million people. What about this bill does anything to address that problem? Since 1998, the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has cost an estimated 2 million lives, a holocaust of sorts, most the victim of hunger and disease; and at least another 2 million have been displaced. What about this bill does anything to address that problem?

Mr. Chairman, these are serious problems that require real resources to address them, not just lip service. After general debate, I will offer an amendment that offers a comprehensive approach to addressing this emergency in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), an absolutely invaluable member of our subcommittee, extraordinarily knowledgeable and has really contributed to the work of this subcommittee.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentlewoman from New York for one thing in particular. They have created a work atmosphere between the two parties on this bill that is the envy of the Committee on Ways and Means. I really take my hat off to both of them. I also wanted to take one moment to talk about the bill we just passed, the Commerce-State-Justice bill, which every Member of this Congress has helped fund the rewards program.

The State Department rewards program is the key program that led to the incident with Uday and Qusay Hussein and their untimely demise. It is this program which sometimes gets down to one basic fact: Who helping the United States wants to be a millionaire? We will pay this \$15 million set of rewards, and it is this program that I think gives us the best chance to capture Saddam Hussein.

But turning now to the foreign operations bill, this bill represents a bipartisan decision by the American people since World War II that foreign policy matters, a subcommittee created by the Marshall Plan that is designed to reduce or prevent war and to lower the number of casualties or deployments by the U.S. military around the world. This bill visibly helps us respond to new challenges, Iraq and North Korea, Iran and Liberia, by substantially reducing the chance that the U.S. military will be deployed in other places in support of our allies. And look particularly at the Middle East where the little democracy of Israel has not faced a direct threat to her existence in the 1980s or 1990s, largely because of support from this legislation.

One of the big questions that we face today is funding to support our war against HIV/AIDS. As a staffer in this Congress, I helped start this program in 1987 with a small earmark of \$30 million. Since that time, our commitment has grown substantially. If we look in this bill and years prior, what has our commitment to AIDS funding been? In fiscal year 1999, \$139 million; in fiscal year 2000, \$200 million; in 2001, \$415 million; in 2002, \$485 million; in 2003, \$893 million; and in this bill, \$1.27 billion, just in the foreign operations bill, just to fight AIDS, a substantial commitment, one that I am proud having seen in 1987, the start of this program that we have funded.

□ 1600

And it underscores one key point when we take on the commitment to treat someone with HIV, we need to fund a program that can sustain that commitment. If we provide money in ways that are not politically sustainable, we could have some sort of scandal in a provider that would undermine political support for this. That would lead to the international community withdrawing support for an HIV patient. By having a responsible uptick in our support for the fight against AIDS, we are understanding a key point. When we make a commitment to a patient with HIV, we are going to do so in a way that sustains that commitment because success right now in this battle is that this patient will survive, and therefore we need to continue funding our battle. If we do it in an unsustainable way or in an irresponsible way that undermines political support, bad GAO investigations, exposes on the fleecing of America, we will undermine political support. People's lives are at stake here, and that is why doing it in a responsible way, when we make a commitment to a patient we can keep that commitment.

And to the chairman, I really thank him for his personal commitment on the HIV issue because he has really sustained one of the highest ideals.

So when we look at the United States, we have to see what have we done as compared to other countries. The nearest commitment of any other country to the 1.27 billion commitment in this bill is the government of the United Kingdom, which provided \$313 million in the fight against AIDS. In fact, the United States gives more money to fight AIDS than all of the European Union and Japan combined. That is a monument to the idealism and foreign policy foresight of the United States. It is underscored in this bill.

And to the chairman and to our ranking minority member I really want to take my hats off to them for sustaining this commitment. Hundreds of thousands of people's lives will be sustained by this, and this ramp-up in just several years from under \$139 million to now \$1.27 billion is a real testament to our idealism.

I also want to thank the chairman for his commitment to cross-border programs in Tibet. We understand that there are 140,000 Tibetans outside China, 6 million inside China, and this bill sustains a political effort to enhance the authority and role of the Dalai Lama in Tibet, and I really want to thank them because there is no voice for the Tibetans inside China, and this bill underscores that voice and gives them a real role in their own country where an overwhelming number of Tibetans live, and I want to thank the chairman for that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), distinguished member of the committee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for his leadership in steering another bill to committee under difficult times. To the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our ranking member, who is committed to the international community and has shown that in the leadership, I thank her for yielding me this time and for crafting a bill that I will support in the end as we go through this debate.

As most Members of Congress know and very few members of the country know, the foreign assistance bill is only 1 percent of the total budget of the United States of America. Our budget is \$2.2 trillion, and as the leading power in the world, this foreign assistance bill is not quite 1 percent of that. A good sum and we should be there for the other countries of the world. This budget funds many countries of the world, as was mentioned by our chairperson. Israel, Jordan, and Egypt are fully funded, and I think they should be. Other countries of the world are not so taken care of, and I think we can do better.

At a time when we find the budget shrinking, deficits soaring, and this year we expect a \$455 billion deficit at least, we do have to make certain decisions in how we fund our Government, how we fund our domestic programs, how we fund education, health care, housing, and those things that Americans need. So I understand it when some Americans do not understand that we have a responsibility as a superpower in the world to help other countries less fortunate and who are strategic allies to this country of the United States of America. So the budget before us today crafted by both the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is a good budget. It does have shortcomings, as was mentioned, and I would like to go over a few of those.

The Child Survival and Health account needs to be more fully funded to take care of the problems of the world. We have heard much discussion and we will hear more today about the pandemic of HIV and AIDS. India with over 1 billion people, China with nearly the same or more people, the Caribbean, Russia, and other countries are now finding epidemic proportions of HIV and AIDS. We have servicemen and women in those countries who may be afflicted if we do not act now.

The President was recently in Africa, and I commend him for going. I also commend him for beginning in setting up the Millennium Challenge Account. Any additional foreign assistance that we can give, and the President has shown that he understands this, as the superpower in the world, I believe we must do and I commend him for that.

The HIV/AIDS epidemic is at pandemic proportions. All over this world where our servicemen and women now represent our Nation and in some in-

stances fight to secure the world, we must as the superpower in the world fund this pandemic appropriately and we have not done that. Malaria, tuberculosis, maternal health, family planning we have to step up as the superpower in the world and help those countries as partners in this humane society that we live in. Postnatal care, those kinds of things that help various countries who are less fortunate and who are not able to help themselves, we should be there for them, and many times in this budget we are unable to do that.

Agriculture, in many of those same countries, agriculture is how they not only feed themselves but are able to export their agriculture products, thereby making it a revenue base for their countries. It is our responsibility to join with them in partnership to help them with that. In some instances we do, but I believe that we can do better. The ESF account, the Economic Support Fund, that we also use to help other countries is also underfunded. It could be better and it is less than what the President recommended and less coming out of our budget. Those are just a few areas.

We are the superpower of the world. It is up to us as leaders of the free world to maintain stability around the world where we can, and we must not forget the men and women who risk their lives every day for us, freedom in this country and around the world, to make sure that they have the best health care that they need to sustain themselves and their families.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), my good friend.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. This bill appropriates \$17.1 billion for foreign aid and export assistance, \$1.8 billion less than the President requested and \$6.5 billion less than what we provided last year. And while I am disappointed that we fall short of the \$3 billion that the President promised for combating global AIDS and HIV, I commend the committee for taking the first steps by appropriating \$2 billion in fiscal year 2004.

Last year 2.4 million Africans died of AIDS-related illnesses while nearly 30 million continue to live with the disease, irrevocably changing the lives of millions of women and children. I have spent a lot of time in South Africa. I have seen how this devastated this land, and we cannot only take the opportunity to go on trips and take photographs and believe that we are addressing the problems of Africa. Just as we have an opportunity with this bill to make a difference in those lives, to change those lives for the better and to offer some small measure of hope, we have an opportunity to make a real difference in the lives of millions of women and children in this country by extending the child tax credit to them. Six and one half million families, 12

million children were left out of the child tax credit expansion, almost 4 million single mothers, 56 percent of all single parents. Women are experiencing the very worst of the economic slowdown. Average annual earnings of low-income single mothers in decline for 3 years running, the unemployment rate of low-income single mothers rising twice as fast as the overall rate. Single and married women both are less likely than men to receive unemployment benefits to help them through their period of joblessness, and we are nearing a crisis level for these women and their families.

Tax relief is supposed to be about lifting these families up and out of such circumstances. If we extend the child tax credit to these families, they will on average receive \$276 in this year alone. To some it might not seem like a lot of money, but \$276 can mean all the difference. Health insurance for the 9 million children in this country without health care, clothes on their backs, school supplies. Two hundred thousand military families, 900,000 Head Start families, 42,000 families of those teaching in Head Start were left out. Just as playing a role in the battle against global HIV/AIDS, it is a matter of values, morals, something that we ought to be committed to doing. So is assisting women and the 12 million children in this country who need our help the most.

So we want to call on the President to use his moral leadership to urge this House to accept the other body's bill and bring justice to these families. They deserve it. Let us give them that.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, we went to conference on the child tax legislation on June 12. It is now July 23. The conference committee has never met.

In light of the fact that 6.5 million American families, including our military families fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan, will not receive their child tax credits when they are mailed out on Friday, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purposes of offering a motion?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut for the purposes of offering a motion.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MS.

DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 318, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

## AYES—84

Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Bell  
Berry  
Bishop (NY)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Crowley  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Eshoo  
Evans

Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Grijalva  
Hastings (FL)  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jones (OH)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Kleczka  
Kucinich  
Lantos  
Lewis (GA)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McIntyre  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Napolitano

Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sandlin  
Schakowsky  
Slaughter  
Snyder  
Solis  
Stark  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Thompson (MS)  
Udall (NM)  
Jenkins  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Woolsey

## NOES—318

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (OK)  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann

Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeGette  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley (OR)  
Hostettler

Houghton  
Hunter  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Janklow  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markley  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCotter  
McCreery  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald

Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal (MA)  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pascrell  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman

Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Saxton  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeltton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—33

Berkley  
Bishop (UT)  
Boozman  
Boucher  
Case  
Culberson  
Delahunt  
Dingell  
Dooley (CA)  
Edwards  
English

Ferguson  
Ford  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Gerlach  
Gonzalez  
Hulshof  
Hyde  
Jefferson  
Kennedy (RI)  
LaTourette

Menendez  
Platts  
Pryce (OH)  
Rothman  
Ryun (KS)  
Smith (WA)  
Sullivan  
Tauzin  
Thomas  
Wamp  
Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1703

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Messrs. BACHUS, INSLEE and COX changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 4 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Much time has passed since the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) spoke; but I did want to make one comment about her remarks, and I appreciate her support for the bill. She made a comment about how the level of funding in this bill is significantly less than last year. We need to remember that this is just about \$1 billion more than the previous year's regular appropriation bill for foreign assistance. If we are going to consider apples to apples, that is what we need to consider.

We have no idea what level of a supplemental appropriation request we might receive from the President that might be transmitted during the coming year for foreign assistance; but if we are going to consider the regularly funded, basic programs, apples to apples, we need to remind ourselves that we are \$1 billion above where we were last year. This is the second largest increase of any subcommittee's allocation. Only the Subcommittee on Homeland Security has a bigger increase than this subcommittee received for its allocation.

So we have been, I think, generously treated; and I think our programs are well funded.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman, and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking minority member and my good friend, for their work to craft a fair and balanced bill. Representing the most diverse congressional district in the country, I know how important U.S. foreign assistance is to nations around the globe, and I have seen the success of our foreign assistance firsthand.

This is a fair and balanced bill. I thank the chairman and ranking member for supporting priorities of mine, including the Middle East Children's Association and increased money for the International Fund for Ireland, in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, but it could be a great bill. The President recently hopped around Africa talking about his global HIV/AIDS initiative, which this Congress passed. What he did not talk about, though, was that his request for funding for HIV/AIDS was \$1 billion less than the authorizing legislation provided. Think about the lives \$1 billion could save.

This bill includes \$25 million for the U.N. Population Fund, but we all know that the money has about as much of a chance of being released by this administration as the New York Mets do to win a World Series this year; and this bill continues to mandate the onerous global gag rule which keeps funding away from groups such as Bangladeshi Rural Advancement Committee, or BRAC, and their work to improve child and maternal health. Mr. Chairman, while the administration should fulfill its commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS, support UNFPA and remove the onerous global gag rule.

There is much work in this bill, particularly to be done when we look at the Middle East. The selection of a new prime minister for the Palestinian Authority, along with the concerted effort

of the European Union and Russia, along with Israel, shows that progress can be made in the Middle East.

The support in this bill for Israel, as well as Jordan, a steadfast ally and proponent of stability, is worthwhile. I am encouraged by movements from countries such as UAE, Oman and Qatar to reestablish contact with the

Israeli government, and I urge the government of Egypt to make the moves to take what is a cold peace with the Jewish state and turn it into a warmer and deeper relationship.

I also want to take this opportunity on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), who is unable to be here because of the

death of her mother, to express the support she has in this legislation for the State of Israel.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip of the House.

#### **N O T I C E**

***Incomplete record of House proceedings.***

***Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***